

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVI

July 1918

NUMBER 3

PELLES, PELLINOR, AND PELLEAN IN THE OLD FRENCH ARTHURIAN ROMANCES

In the *Romanic Review*, IV (1913), 462 ff., I have combatted the theory of Brugger and others that at some hypothetical earlier stage in the development of the Old French Arthurian romances in prose a Perceval *Queste* held the place which in the existing Vulgate cycle is held by the Galahad *Queste*. In the elaboration of this theory of antecedent cycles,¹ H. O. Sommer, *Modern Philology*,² V (1908), 291 ff., and *Romania*, XXXVI (1907), 369 ff., 543 ff., and E. Brugger, *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Litteratur*, XL (1913), 47 ff., note 11, have made the characters named in the title of the present article play no unimportant part.³ It is my purpose, however, in the following pages to show that we do not have to resort to any theory of hypothetical antecedent cycles to explain the origin of these characters and the occasional inconsistencies and contradictions which we

¹ The only cycle actually preserved, besides the genuine, though fragmentary, de Borron cycle and the Vulgate, is that which the MSS falsely ascribe to Robert de Borron. In the above-mentioned article, pp. 429 ff., 465 ff. (including note 104), I have tried to show—especially with reference to the Mort Arthur and Quest sections—that this cycle is really derived from the Vulgate and not from a common source of the two. Cf., for the Quest section, the valuable article of A. Pauphilet, *Romania*, XXXVI (1907), 594 ff.

² The "Galahad and Perceval" text, to which Sommer's discussion is attached, furnishes the approximate original to Malory's Books XI and XII. The text is obviously late and largely based on Part III of the *Lancelot*. E. Wechsler, *Über die verschiedenen Redaktionen des Robert von Borron sugeschriebenen Graal-Lancelot-Cyklus*, pp. 18 f. (Halle, 1895), assumes that it is a part of the *Lancelot* of the pseudo-Robert cycle.

³ In her *Legend of Sir Perceval*, II, 343, note (London, 1909), Miss J. L. Weston supposes that the successive writers in whose works Pelles and Pellinor appear were drawing independently from oral tradition in regard to these characters. This view, however, has not an iota of evidence in its favor.

find in our manuscript tradition with reference to their relations to one another and to the Grail. As will be seen, I distinguish especially two sets of circumstances as responsible for these inconsistencies or contradictions, the first pertaining to the original authors of the romances, the second to the scribes or redactors.

1. The different romances, or "branches," as our MSS commonly call them, which make up the Vulgate cycle were, generally speaking, composed by different men,¹ and the successive authors might, either through faults of memory or intentionally, introduce innovations in respect to previously existing characters, or, for some reason or other, invent new characters outright. For, after all, these romances, though connected with each other in a way, were also separate works, and each author exercised more or less the liberty of invention, without any idea of maintaining a strict scientific accuracy in harmonizing his own branch with the branches of his predecessors. Very frequently, no doubt, while composing, such an author would not have the latter works at hand, but even if he had them and were disposed to establish exact conformity with the other branches it would not always be an easy task to look up a particular point.

2. On their own responsibility the scribes occasionally attached to the names they were copying anticipatory references or descriptive phrases relating to other branches, or drawn therefrom.² In making these insertions they doubtless depended mainly on memory, and hence the references and phrases, being not always correctly applied, gave rise to inconsistencies and contradictions. Moreover, inasmuch as at the time that our extant MSS were copied all the branches of the cycle were already in existence, a branch like the *Queste*, which stands late in the series, was just as subject to interpolation of this kind from a branch like the *Merlin* (including continuation), which stands earlier, as vice versa. Such contamination of the text may be due also to the influence of other romances besides those of the Vulgate cycle—such romances, for example, as Chrétien's *Perceval* or the *Merlin* continuation (*Livre d'Artus*) of

¹ Miss Weston, *Legend of Sir Lancelot*, p. 139 (London, 1901), argues that *Queste* and *Grand St. Graal* (*Estoire del Saint Graal*) are by the same author. So, too, Brugger, *Zs. f. frz. spr. u. Litt.* XXIX (1905), 89, note 45.

² Of course, they sometimes took larger liberties than these with their texts, recasting, interpolating passages of varying length, etc., but I am concerned here merely with the shorter additions.

MS 337. Theoretically, indeed, there is no reason why we should not find in our MSS scribal insertions drawn from romances of the pseudo-Robert de Borron cycle, or the *Perlesvaus*, or even the prose *Tristan*, since these romances were doubtless already in existence before the archetype MS of any branch of the Vulgate cycle, as we have it today, was written. For it should not be forgotten: (a) that from fifty to sixty years must have elapsed between the composition of the latest member of the Vulgate cycle and the date of our earliest extant manuscript of any part of that cycle, during which period these romances, the most popular works of their age, must have undergone very frequent transcription;¹ (b) that the archetype of our MSS of any branch of the Vulgate cycle does not necessarily represent that branch as it was originally composed.² All extant MSS go back to copies which had been adjusted to the cyclic form, wherever such adjustments seemed still required, and these particular copies may have been altered in passages from the original form of the individual romance, to say nothing of omissions. Hence a corruption or interpolation may run through a large number even of the best MSS or, indeed, through them all.

In view of the varying conceptions of the different romancers as to the functions or relationships of particular characters, and in view, also, of the frequent difficulty they must have encountered in consulting the texts concerned, one may say that it was the most natural thing in the world, if the scribes did introduce into their texts such contradictions and inconsistencies as I have indicated above. After some twenty years of editing Arthurian texts, Dr. Sommer speaks³ of Perceval as being nephew of the Fisher King in Chrétien's *Perceval*, whereas he is really his cousin (cf. ll. 6377 ff.), and interprets as

¹ We know that the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, which there is every reason to believe was the latest part of the cycle, except the *Merlin* continuation, was composed by 1216. See my discussion of the subject, *Romanic Review*, III (1912), 185 ff. On the other hand, the earliest dated MS, and probably as early a MS as any extant of any part of the Vulgate cycle, viz. MS 342 of the Bibliothèque nationale, is from the year 1274. Cf. the description of it in my edition of the *Mort Artu*, p. xv.

² Brugger, *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XL, 48, note, has made this remark with regard to the *Lancelot*, and I have pointed out the same thing with regard to the *Queste* (*Romanic Review*, IV, 466 ff.).

³ *Modern Philology*, V, 295. Note, too, how Sir John Rhŷs, throughout his *Studies in the Arthurian Legend* (Oxford, 1891), unsuspectingly accepts the blunder of the Welsh translator of the *Perlesvaus*, who made a King Peleur (a proper name) out of the Old French *roi pescheur*.

Perceval's father the wrong Pellinor¹ in the *Livre d'Artus* of MS 337, as will be seen later in this article. In such cases, we do not jump to the conclusion that Dr. Sommer had access to lost versions of these romances. Why, then, should we do so when we come across similar blunders in the work of a mediaeval copyist who, in transcribing some passage, took upon himself for the nonce the functions of an editor? In criticizing Miss Weston, Brugger observes:² "Wenn einzelne Kopisten Widersprüche tilgen, so entstehen dadurch noch nicht jüngere Redaktionen." But the converse is equally true: "Wenn einzelne Kopisten Widersprüche einführen, so entstehen dadurch noch nicht ältere Redaktionen."³

Owing to the circumstances which I have just described, the problem of ascertaining what is original in our texts and what is not is extremely complex, but until we have attempted a solution with a full consideration of these undeniable conditions we are not justified in taking refuge in theories of lost versions.

Let us examine now the occurrence of these three characters in the romances.

I. Pelles.

Pelles was, no doubt, the creation either of the author of the *Queste* or of one of the authors⁴ of Part III (often called the *Agravain*) of the prose *Lancelot*, viz., of those portions of Part III which relate to the begetting of Galahad and which prepare for the achievements of that character as narrated in the *Queste*. Brugger, to be sure, says⁵ that he first appeared in the hypothetical redaction of the

¹ *The Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, VII, 243, note 1 (Washington, D.C., 1913).

² *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXX (1906), 177, note.

³ R. Heinzel, *Über die französischen Gralromane*, pp. 65 f., note (Wien, 1891), has discussed in detail the characters, Pelles, Pellehem, and Pellinor. He has made allowance in a considerable measure for scribal confusions, but does not attempt to fix definitely the origin of each character. In a study like the present, one is hampered seriously, of course, by the want of critical editions of the romances involved. The genealogy of the MSS has not been worked out for any branch of the Vulgate cycle, except, after a fashion, for the earlier part of the *Lancelot*, by Professor E. Wechssler's pupils in the *Marburger Beiträge zur romanischen Philologie*, 1911, *et seq.* The only record we have of the variant forms of the names in particular passages is that which Dr. Sommer has given us in the notes of his *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, and that is not complete.

⁴ The authors here distinguished may possibly be one and the same person. I expect to discuss this question in a forthcoming article on the composition of the prose *Lancelot*.

⁵ *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XL, 48, note.

Perlesvaus which figures in his theory of the evolution of the prose romances. But, in questions like this, one cannot be expected to accept appeals to indefinite hypothetical redactions, especially as in the above-mentioned article I have endeavored to refute the contention which seems to be the main reason for Brugger's hypothesis of an earlier form of the *Perlesvaus*—namely, that a Perceval *Queste* once held the place in the Vulgate cycle which the Galahad *Queste* does in all the extant MSS. The only *Perlesvaus* we know—that which is preserved in the MSS—is, in my judgment, a very late romance. Birch-Hirschfeld gave substantial reasons for this conclusion forty years ago in his *Sage vom Gral*, pp. 135 ff.,¹ and one

¹ His views were accepted by Alfred Nutt, *Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail*, p. 64; by A. Jeanroy, in his review of Nitze's *Perlesvaus* in the *Revue Critique*, Oct. 10, 1904; by W. Foerster, who added a new argument from the name *Perlesvaus*, see *Kristian von Troyes: Wörterbuch zu seinen sämtlichen Werken*, Introduction, p. 186 (1914); and by others. See W. A. Nitze's dissertation, *The Old French Grail Romance Perlesvaus*, pp. 20 ff., for a summary of opinions pro and con on the subject up to 1902. Nitze does not indicate, however, that Heinzel was inclined to accept even Gerbert (who wrote probably about 1220) as a source of the *Perlesvaus*. But cf. Heinzel's *Über die französischen Gralromane*, p. 172. Nitze, himself, puts it between 1200 and 1212, which, in my opinion, is too early. He has returned to the subject in his article, "Glastonbury and the Holy Grail," *Modern Philology*, I (1903), 247 ff., but his conclusions depend on an acceptance, among other things, of the genuineness of early Arthurian traditions at Glastonbury, which, in my judgment, has been disproved by W. W. Newell, "William of Malmesbury on the Antiquity of Glastonbury," *Publications of the Modern Language of America*, XVIII (1903), 459 ff. The passage from *Johannes Glastoniensis* (fifteenth century), communicated by Baist and quoted by Nitze, note 2, seems to me a mere compilation of details from the romances and from chronicles that have no necessary connection with the supposed early Arthurian traditions at Glastonbury, which at that time Nitze accepted. Moreover, in this article, pp. 252 f., Nitze has discussed *Pelles* briefly, but Sommer's recent *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, seven vols. (Washington, D.C., 1908–13), which makes the *Lancelot* accessible for the first time and which gives for the *Grand St. Graal (Estoire del Saint Graal)* and *Queste* a fuller record of MS readings than had been previously available, puts new materials at our disposal for the study of these questions, and if my solution of them on the basis of such materials is correct, it will be a sufficient answer to Nitze's interpretation of *Pelles'* origin and development in the Grail romances. I will only add that when the Welsh version of the *Queste* makes *Pelles'* daughter marry Lancelot, this change from the story as told in the MSS of the Vulgate cycle is, in my opinion, introduced by the author merely in the interests of a higher morality. I see no reason either to believe that the *Perlesvaus* ever existed in a (lost) Latin form. The only Latin Arthurian romances we know of, the *Historia Meriadoci* and *De Ortu Waluuanii* (see my edition of these romances, Halle, 1913), besides being relatively short, are late, and based on earlier French romances. *Arthur and Gorlagon*, edited by G. L. Kittredge (Boston, 1903), is merely a Welsh folktale in Latin dress. Even that, however, exists only in a late fourteenth century MS.

As against the remarks which I have just made, it should be said that Nitze expects soon to publish some new external evidence in support of his dating of the *Perlesvaus*, which, for the rest, was accepted by W. Golther in his review of the above-mentioned dissertation, *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXVI² (1903), 12 ff., and apparently by G. Paris, *Littérature française au moyen âge* (Bibliography, § 60), as confirming his own well-known views on the place of the *Perlesvaus* among the Grail romances. Quite recently, in *Studies in Philology*, XV, 7 ff. (University of North Carolina, 1918), Nitze has again endeavored to establish an intimate connection between the *Perlesvaus* and Glastonbury. The

may add other evidence to that effect, as, for example, its dependence on the *Lancelot* with reference to Claudas and to Lancelot's relations with Guinevere. Note, too, such details as the absurdity of Perceval's alighting under an olive tree in Great Britain(!)¹ (Potvin, I, 198), imitated from Wauchier, ll. 17595, 18247, 18562, 18609, 18670,² the Castle of Copper episode in the *Perlesvaus*, which is derived from the episode of Dolerouse Garde³ in the *Lancelot*, III, 144, 151, 191, the scar on Lohot's forehead (Potvin, I, 222), imitated from Gerbert (Potvin, VI, 200, scar on Perceval's forehead). In his review (*Revue*

evidence which he has adduced proves, I think, that the author of the *Perlesvaus* was trying to identify Avalon with Glastonbury, but his knowledge is too inexact for a resident of the place, or, indeed, for any one who had visited it. For example, if we accept with Nitze the mountain of the romance, p. 261, as meant for the Tor (the hill which rises up so abruptly from the surrounding country at Glastonbury)—and this seems to me, too, most probable—the placing of the Lady Chapel on it, as Nitze, himself, has pointed out, p. 12, would be incorrect. Moreover, the *Perlesvaus* tells us, p. 261, that there were houses with *vergiers* and *clos* on this mountain. But on the steep cone of the Tor there is no room for these things. Accepting the identification of Avalon and Glastonbury in the *Perlesvaus*, we have, as Nitze says, a *terminus a quo* for the dating of that romance, viz., 1191 (the year of the pretended exhumation of Arthur and Guinevere at Glastonbury), but nothing more, as far as I can see. I had already pointed out the same thing (*Revue Celtique*, XXXIII, 432, note, and *The Romanic Review*, IV, 454, including note 76) with reference to the *Vulgata Mort Artu*, in which the author awkwardly combines the old Celtic tradition concerning Arthur's translation to Avalon with the new idea, started in 1191 by the monks of Glastonbury, that he was buried at the abbey there. The only difference here between the *Mort Artu* and *Perlesvaus*, in my opinion, is that the author of the latter tried to introduce some local details into his description, and blundered in doing so. Since this note was put in type, I have observed that the description, *Perlesvaus*, p. 261, corresponds strikingly, in many essential details, to that of the visit of Gawain and Hector, first to the chapel on the mountain and then to the hermitage, similarly situated in *Queste VI*, 106–11. So, after all, instead of being local, the details in *Perlesvaus* are probably borrowed from the *Queste*.

¹ The description of Perceval (Potvin, I, 37), "Il a cheif d'or et regard de lion, et nombril de virge pucele, et cuer d'acier, et cors d'olifant, et tesches sanz vileinnie," is virtually identical with the description of Galahad, *Lancelot*, IV, 27, but this description of Galahad, like all the materials relating to that character in the *Lancelot*, could not have belonged to the romance in its original form, and is, of course, interpolated. The interpolation was drawn, no doubt, from the *Perlesvaus*, like other references and interpolations in our *Lancelot* MSS. See my remarks in *The Romanic Review*, IV, 469 f. and in my article "The Composition of the Old French prose *Lancelot*," which is soon to appear in the same review. We find the above description (applied to Perceval) again in the *Livre d'Artus* of MS. 337, VII, 52.

² P. Paris, *Romans de la Table Ronde*, II, 306, note, states that "olivier" in the romances written in Northern France always means "willow," but this seems very questionable. Wauchier, doubtless, took this feature over mechanically from *Chansons de geste* that dealt with Southern France.

The idea of "Il Chevaliers au Cercle d'Or" in the *Perlesvaus*, Potvin, I, 281 ff. and 241 ff., may have been suggested by Patrides au Cercle d'Or of the *Lancelot*, IV, 266, 294 ff., 300. A knight of the same name (nephew of Baudemagus), and, in reality, probably identical with this Patrides, is given, *Lancelot*, V, 337, a crown of laurel as a reward of valor. Later, V, 337 ff. he is freed from captivity by Perceval. In Chrétien's *Erec*, I, 1712, we have, already, it is true, a "a Vallez au cercle d'or," but he is a mere name.

³ I have already dealt with this matter in *Modern Philology*, X, 10 ff.

Critique for Oct. 10, 1904) of Nitze's *Perlesvaus* dissertation, A. Jeanroy has also pointed out the indebtedness of that romance to the *Vengeance de Ragnide*.¹

Assuming then that the *Perlesvaus* is of comparatively late date, I will say that the circumstances under which the character of Pelles was created, it seems to me, were as follows: In Chrétien's *Perceval*, ll. 3471 ff., 4633 ff., we have the unnamed Fisher King, who is at the same time the Maimed King. But we are left to infer that the Fisher King's father (unnamed) is also maimed, for it is said (ll. 6391 ff.) that he had not quitted the mysterious Grail chamber for fifteen years.

Now, the authors of the *Queste* and of the passages involved in *Lancelot*, Part III (to use, for convenience' sake, Sommer's division of the *Lancelot*), were contented with one Maimed King as well as with one Fisher King, and they kept as the Maimed King the strange character who had not left his room for fifteen years, while they rationalized to some degree the real Lord of the Grail Castle, the Fisher King, whose rather active participation in the story hardly admitted of disability through lameness,² and conferred on him a definite name, Pelles. They did not, however, make the new Fisher King, Pelles, the son of their Maimed King, probably owing to Pelles' somewhat rationalized character. They left the relationship undefined. The conflict thus brought about between Chrétien's conceptions of the functions and relationship of the two characters and those of the *Queste* and *Lancelot*, Part III, is the source of constant confusion for scribes and redactors, as we shall soon see, and possibly even for the authors themselves.

Furthermore, it is only by bringing together passages widely separated in Chrétien (3471 ff., on the one hand, and 6378 ff. on the other) that we can establish the identity of the Fisher King with the Maimed King. No doubt, in imitation of Chrétien and to

¹ As regards the relations of the *Perlesvaus* and the Vulgate *Merlin*, we have in our MSS of the latter, II, 316, an undoubted allusion to the *Perlesvaus* (Kaif's killing of Arthur's son, Lohot). Cf. Brugger, *Zs. f. frs. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXXIII, 192 (1903), and my discussion, *The Romanic Review*, III (1912), 183 f.

² In Wauchier, too (cf. ll. 20100 ff.), the Lord of the Grail Castle is not lame, and Wauchier's influence may possibly be responsible, in part, for this feature of the passages under discussion.

maintain the impression of mystery, the authors of the prose romances adopt this device (which with Chrétien was probably not intentional) and rarely identify Pelles in so many words as the Fisher King. There resulted an obscurity which proved a trap to would-be scribal editors.

There are three passages which seem to conflict with this interpretation of the evidence in regard to Pelles' origin and his function in the above-mentioned romances.

1. As just stated, in the *Queste* and in all episodes of Part III (Vol. V of Sommer's *Vulgata Version of the Arthurian Romances*) of the *Lancelot* that involve Grail matters,¹ Pelles is the more or less rationalized reproduction of Chrétien's Fisher King. In V, 303, to our surprise, however, when Bohort (Bors) is visiting the Grail Castle, Pelles, who plays throughout this third division of the *Lancelot* the part of Fisher King² and Lord of the Grail Castle and who had actually been referred to as *le roy pescheour* at p. 191, asks him (Bohort) whether he has seen his (Pelles') father, and on Bohort's replying that he does not know him, says: "cest li roys mahaignies que on apele le roy pesc(h)eor, le plus hardi cheualier & le plus preudomme qui fust a son temps." When Bohort next inquires how Pelles' father became thus maimed, Pelles replies: "Sire, ce fu par le forfait quil fist quant il traist lespee du fuerre qui ne deuoit estre traite deuant que cils le trairoit qui les auentures del saint graal doit achieuer & pour chou fu [il] ferus parmi lez .ij. cuisses de lespee et naura ia garison deuant chou que li boins cheualiers uendra." And it appears from the next paragraph that the wound was inflicted by a lance.

Sommer cites five MSS here that agree with the text just quoted, but does not say whether this agreement runs through all the MSS. In any event, the whole passage, whether it is an interpolation or not,

¹ All references in this article to the romances of the Vulgate cycle are to Sommer's edition. From this point on I will cite merely by volume, omitting Sommer's name and the title of his edition.

² On the other hand, the term Fisher King is only once actually applied to him in Part III of the *Lancelot*, namely, at V, 191, when Lancelot is telling his adventures at Arthur's court, in order that they might be written down. The term is applied also, p. 192, to the King of the Grail Castle in the narrative of Gawain's adventures; but it is to be recalled that in the original narrative of these adventures, prose *Lancelot*, IV, 343 ff., Pelles did not appear, nor was there anything said about a *roi pescheor*.

refers, beyond dispute, to the passage in the *Queste*, VI, 150, where it is related how the Maimed King became maimed. This passage in the *Queste* agrees with V, 303, in all but three particulars: (1) The Maimed King (as nowhere else in the *Queste*) bears here a definite name, which varies with the different MSS. (2) It offers no identification of Maimed King and Fisher King. (3) The Maimed King is not said to be Pelles' father.

The author of the passage V, 503, had then this passage of the *Queste* in mind, but in using it he confounds its conceptions with those of Chrétien's *Perceval*, in which a maimed king, as will be remembered, is the Fisher King (cf. ll. 3471 ff., 4633 ff.), who bears throughout no definite name, and in which the father of the Fisher King (the latter rôle being that which Pelles himself really plays in the *Lancelot*) is also maimed (cf. ll. 6391 ff.). This introduces into the narrative a confusion which an interpolator, it would seem, would be more likely to be guilty of than the writer of the romance, but, in any event, the contamination just spoken of is manifestly the source of the confusion. The author of the passage was, no doubt, trying to harmonize the narrative of Gawain's visit to the Grail Castle (Corbenic) in the *Lancelot*, IV, 343 ff., with that of Lancelot's visit to the same place, V, 107 ff. In the former, the Lord of the Grail Castle who receives Gawain is the Maimed King, and there is no mention of Pelles; in the latter, conditions are just reversed, for here Pelles is the host, and there is no mention of the Maimed King.¹ In neither account of the visit is the term, "Fisher King" used of the Lord of the Grail Castle, and this is only applied to that personage (who is Pelles throughout the *Lancelot* and *Queste*, except in the narrative of Gawain's visit) at V, 191 f., where Lancelot recites at court his adventures. In his effort, however, to harmonize these narratives he also endeavored to explain who the Maimed King was, drawing on the *Queste*, VI, 150, for this purpose, but confounding, as we have seen, the conceptions of this passage of the *Queste* with those of Chrétien's *Perceval*.

2. Pelles, then, is the Fisher King of *Lancelot*, Part III, although he is only distinctly so called at V, 191. In the *Queste* the identification is plainer, for in that branch, wherever the term *roi pescheor*

¹ In the forthcoming article on the composition of the *Lancelot*, referred to above, I shall attempt to explain the difference between the narratives of these two visits.

is used, Pelles is named or implied. The passages are VI, 5 (so the best MSS), 98, 114. But there is one exception to the rule, viz., VI, 8, where Galahad speaks of "mon oncle le roy Pelles et mon aiol le riche roi pescheor." This is, perhaps, the worst *crux* in the whole range of the prose romances, and certainly involves some blunder on the part of scribe or redactor. It seems to me most probable that the person who introduced into our manuscript tradition this impossible reading had before him simply "mon oncle le roy Pelles," where "oncle," as occasionally elsewhere in Old French, meant "grandfather."¹ This person, misunderstanding "oncle" as meaning "uncle," and remembering, nevertheless, that Galahad was always represented as the grandson of the Fisher King, made him send greetings, too, to this grandfather (aiol). As a matter of fact, Pelles and the Fisher King were, of course, one and the same person.²

3. Pelles, is, as we have seen above, the Fisher King,³ but not the Maimed King, in the *Lancelot* and the *Queste*. In one passage, however, *Queste*, VI, 150, he is identified with the Maimed King in a considerable number of MSS. In this passage the writer is explaining how the Maimed King became maimed—viz., by a mysterious lance, as he was drawing the *espee as estranges renges* from its scabbard. "In the majority of the existing MSS," says Sommer (*loc. cit.*, note), the Maimed King is here called Pelles; in MSS M and R, Pellinor;

¹ R. Heinzel, *Über die französischen Gralromane*, p. 66, note, who gives examples from other Arthurian texts, so interprets the word in this passage; so also does E. Brugger in the above-cited article, p. 47, note. "Oncle" acquired, doubtless, this additional signification, because of the double meaning of the word for "nephew," *nies, neuue*, which, like its Latin etymon, *nepos, nepotem*, could mean "grandson" as well as "nephew." As Heinzel and Brugger remark, when Pelles in the *Queste*, VI, 187, calls Galahad his *neueu*, this certainly means "grandson"; for Pelles, wherever he appears in the Arthurian romances, is always the father of Galahad's mother. Cf. for the *Queste* alone, VI, 5, 9, 16, 98, 99, 182. Sommer, VI, 187, having himself only recently discovered the varying meanings of Old French *nies, neuue*, imagines that no Grail student had ever observed this before him. But his discovery has done him little good, for he still prefers the rendering, "nephew."

² The passage reads as I have given it according to Sommer in the MS on which his edition is based (British Museum, Additional, 10294), as also in MSS. A (B. M. Additional 17443), C (B. M. Royal 20, C. VI), G (B. M. Royal 14, E. III) and R (B. M. Royal 19, C. XIII). M (Bibliothèque Nationale, 342) has "monsignore le roi pelles & mon aiol le riche roi pescheor." The variant of M would leave the main difficulty untouched. These are the only MSS of which Sommer gives any record.

³ It is true that MS C in *Queste*, VI, 13, identifies the Maimed King with the Fisher King, who in this romance is Pelles, and *ibid.*, p. 186, identifies Pelles with the Maimed King, but these are isolated variants which arose, no doubt, through Chrétien's influence. MS R possibly supports C in regard to the first of these passages.

in A, Parlan (= Pellehan ?); in C, Urbains = Urlains of *Queste*, VI, 156, no doubt, who was the enemy of the Maimed King's father, but suffered a fate like that of the Maimed King himself, owing to which circumstance the scribe of C confounded the two. But everywhere else in the *Queste*, Pelles is entirely distinct from the Maimed King, and, as Sommer suggests, the reading "Pelles" here is, without doubt, incorrect. To be sure, as the Maimed King nowhere else in the *Queste* is given a specific name, it is equally safe to assert that the names given to that personage in the other MSS in this passage are likewise unauthorized. I have already explained the variant (Urbains) of C. The reading (Parlan) of A is due most likely to the scribe's recollection of the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 290, where the Maimed King is in some MSS called Pelleam (Pellehan). Pellinor, in MSS M and R, was suggested most probably by the *Merlin* continuation of the Vulgate cycle or of MS 337 (*Livre d'Artus*), for outside of the late pseudo-Robert de Borron cycle and prose *Tristan* and the reading of these two MSS in the present passage the name is only known to the two *Merlin* continuations—in each as the name of a maimed king. The passages in the mind of the scribe or redactor were most probably Vulgate *Merlin*, II, 125, 159, or *Livre d'Artus* of MS 337, VII, 146, 243—passages which we shall have to return to in another connection.

But how did it happen that in this one passage of the *Queste* all the MSS should concur in giving the Maimed King a definite name? This was probably due to a blunder in the archetype of the extant MSS.¹ The scribe of the archetype either from sheer confusion of mind or laboring under the influence of Chrétien, who, as we have seen, identified Fisher King and Maimed King, for the moment

¹ With regard to my assumption of a blunder in the archetype, this is not so hazardous a conjecture as it might seem at first blush, for, indisputably, the slaying of Baudemagus by Gawain was wanting in this archetype. The incident of the slaying is essential to the narrative and must originally have been a part of the Vulgate *Queste*, but it is not found in any extant MS of the Vulgate cycle, although, as I pointed out in my edition of the Vulgate *Mort Artu*, p. 266, it is preserved in MS 112 of the Bibliothèque Nationale. In any case, we face here a blunder of scribe or redactor, for nowhere else in the *Queste* or *Lancelot* is the Maimed King named.

In the manuscript tradition of Chrétien's *Yrain*, 11. 907 ff., we have an exact parallel to the corruption which I here surmise for the *Queste*—blunder in the archetype with attempts to emend on the part of later redactors (or translators), which increase the confusion. Cf. W. Foerster's note to these lines in his small *Yrain*, 4th edition (Halle, 1912). Foerster cites there also other instances in the manuscript tradition of Chrétien's *Erec* and *Cligés*.

accepted the Maimed King as identical with the Fisher King, who in the *Queste* was Pelles, and so called him Pelles. Later scribes, observing that this was inconsistent with the general conception of the *Queste*, substituted, as stated above, names given the Maimed King in other branches of the cycle: Pellinor, drawn from a *Merlin* continuation, either that of the Vulgate or of MS 337 (see pages cited at the end of the last paragraph), or Pelleam, *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 290, or, in the case of MS C, from the *Queste* itself, Urbain (Urlain), VI, 146, owing to the blunder which I have already explained.¹

As regards the origin of the name, Pelles, I have no doubt that, like a very large percentage of the names in the prose romances, it was fabricated by the author of the romance which first introduced him into literature.² This author made the name of his new Grail King alliterate with that of Chrétien's Grail Knight, Perceval,³ as was often done in such cases. Perhaps, *Perlesvaus*, *Pellesvaus*, had already arisen as an occasional variant of Perceval's name. Or, possibly, *Pelles* may be an approximation to *Peleus* (*Pelleus*), name of the father of the great Greek hero, Achilles, in the *Roman de Troie*. Some of the most

¹ This is Brugger's explanation of *Pelleam* and *Pellinor* (as modeled on *Pelles*). Cf. his above-mentioned article, p. 48, note. His explanation is evidently correct, but I have no doubt that the same explanation applies to Pelles, too. W. Foerster maintained that even the name, *Perceval*, was Chrétien's invention. See his *Chrétien Wörterbuch*, Introduction, p. 165.

The late Sir John Rhŷs, *Studies in the Arthurian Legend*, pp. 273 ff. (Oxford, 1891), tried, on the other hand, to derive *Pelles* from *Pwyll*, name of the Welsh Otherworld prince, but the argument to me as to Heinzel (see his *Grail* treatise, p. 66, note), is not convincing. Nitze, however, accepts and adds to it in his above-quoted article, p. 254, and again, *PMLA*, XXIV, 379, note 2.

² Brugger, in the note just quoted, gives examples of this practice of the Old French romances from other texts. It makes no difference that in the Vulgate cycle, except in one corrupt passage of the *Lancelot*, III, 29, where Perceval is said to be Pelles' son, the blood relationship of the two characters is of the most shadowy kind. They were both intimately connected with the Grail, and that was enough.

On the subject of this blood relationship it is to be observed that the author of the *Queste* of the Vulgate cycle, having displaced Chrétien's Perceval by Galahad as the Grail Knight, was disposed to obscure altogether Perceval's connection with the Grail King. (In Chrétien, 6377 ff. Perceval was nephew of the mysterious person who was served by the Grail, father of the Fisher King.) Consequently, the only direct recognition of the original connection between Perceval and the Fisher King or his father is to be found in two passages of the *Queste*, (a) VI, 53, where Perceval's aunt speaks of herself as once queen of the *terre gaste*, in which, of course, the Grail Castle (Corbenic) was situated; (b) VI, 59, where this aunt speaks to Perceval of Pelles as "uostra parent." Even when, VI, 187, Galahad, Perceval, and Bohort come to Corbenic, Pelles recognizes Galahad as his *nœveu*, but no intimation is given that he (Pelles) was related to Perceval.

Sommer suggests, VI, 188, note 3, that Pelles' saintly *niece* there mentioned is "Perceval's sister come to life again." But this cannot be, for the death of Perceval's sister had been fully related, p. 171. Consequently, this passage furnishes no indication of Pelles' relationship to Perceval.

prominent names in the Arthurian prose romances, e.g., *Hector, Palamades*, are taken from this source.¹

Having determined now, as I hope, the origin and position of Pelles in *Lancelot*, Part III, and the *Queste*, I need not dwell at length on this character as he is found in the other texts.

In the whole of *Lancelot*, Part II, his name does not occur at all, in Part I but twice, viz., III, 29, 117. It is to be remembered that the two parts embrace 792 large octavo pages in Sommer's edition and that even the second of these mere allusions—for they are nothing more—is separated by 782 such octavo pages from the passage in Part III where the name next occurs. Under these circumstances, I have, for my own part, no doubt that Pelles was unknown to the authors of the earlier portions of the *Lancelot* and that the incidental allusions to him there are really interpolated under the influence of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation in which his name occurs so frequently—definitely, under the influence of the passage, II, 159, which I shall have to discuss more fully in a moment in connection with the name Pellinor. In III, 29, we have the same comparison of Guinevere's beauty to that of Elaine sans per and Galahad's mother, which occurs

¹ Pelles is called *Pelles de la terre Foraine* in the *Lancelot*, Part III. Cf. V, 107, 122. In neither passage is he called king of the Terre Foraine, but his daughter (Galahad's mother) is referred to, p. 106, as "fille le roy de la terre foraine," so he is king of that country. As remarked above, this trick of leaving scattered in different parts of the text the various elements that are necessary to establish the identity of a character is habitual with the authors of the Grail romances. Similarly Corbenic is in the Terre Foraine, but this is not expressly stated anywhere.

Apart from the three passages just cited, there is only one other mention of the Terre Foraine in *Lancelot*, Part III, viz., V, 246, where it is said that Lancelot's grandfather (*Lancelot*) was king of "la blanche terre qui marchist a la terre foraine." Cf. also variant in MS R at p. 243.

In the rest of the *Lancelot* we have only one occurrence of a Terre Foraine, viz., IV, 163. But here the name is applied to the kingdom of Baudemagus—*Gorre* as Chrétien calls it. I believe that at least the passages of *Lancelot*, Part III, in which Pelles figures are by a different hand from the earlier parts of the *Lancelot*, and am inclined to think that the author of these Pelles episodes derived the name from IV, 163. There is no allusion to the Terre Foraine anywhere in the *Queste*. In the *Mort Artu*, it is mentioned three times as one of Lancelot's dominions, VI, 292, 304, 316, and unconnected with Pelles. In the *Estoire del Saint Graal* the name is found once, I, 286, as the land which was settled by Alain and his brothers and in which the Grail Castle (Corbenic) was built. In the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation it also occurs once, II, 384, in connection with the Maimed King, Alain—"Helain de la Terre Foraine."

In the opening pages of the *Queste*, VI, 3, 5, we have Pelles de Listenois. This appellation is found in the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, II, 125, 159, 221, 352, 359, 384, 388 (implied), 395, 422, and nowhere else in the Vulgate cycle, save III, 117 (*Lancelot*, Part I), where interpolation from the Vulgate *Merlin* is manifest, since Alain li Gros is his brother. I suspect that the "de Listenois" of VI, 3, 5, is due also to influence of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation.

nowhere else save in II, 159. Similarly, in III, 117, we have Pelles de Listenois and Alain as brothers, as is the case in II, 159, 221, and elsewhere in the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation.

In the *Mort Artu*, Pelles is mentioned only twice, VI, 219, 303, as father of Galahad's mother and Eliezer, respectively. The two references to the *roy pescheor* in this romance, VI, 297, 319, relate to Gawain's visit to the Grail Castle, IV, 343 ff. (*Lancelot*, Part II), where we have a Maimed King who is neither named nor called *roi pescheor*. We have here, then, the customary confusion of the two characters.

Pelles' name occurs only once in the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 290. He is there the descendant of the Maimed King, but he is not himself called either *roi mahaignie* or *roi pescheor*.

The branch in which we find Pelles' name most frequently, although his rôle is not so important here as in the *Lancelot*, Part III, or *Queste*, is the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation. In this branch he is always called Pelles de Listenois. See the examples given in note of the preceding page. In this text, II, 125, he guards his brother, Pellinor; p. 159, he is brother (cf., too, 221, 346, 359) to Alain, who is *riche roi pecheor*, and Pellinor, the *roi mahaignie*.¹ At p. 352, however, Eliezer, Pelles' son (cf. 388, 389), is called son of the *riche roy peschor*—so here Pelles is again the Fisher King as in the *Lancelot*, Part III, and *Queste*. We have, then, evidently in the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation a duplication of the Fisher King, owing to circumstances which I shall take up more fully in discussing Pellinor.

Leaving now the Vulgate cycle and turning to the *Merlin* continuation (*Livre d'Artus*) of MS 337, the author of this romance²

¹ The passage, II, 159, as reproduced from the British Museum MS Add. 10292 by Sommer in his edition is so corrupt as to be in part unintelligible. In *Modern Philology*, V, 305, however, he gives us the correct text from MS 747 of the Bibliothèque Nationale.

² In his article, "Zum *Livre d' Artus*," *Zs. f. romanische Philologie*, XVI, 90 ff., E. Freymond has shown that this romance presupposes all the romances of the Vulgate cycle and hence is of later date. E. Brugger, *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXVIII, 57 f., insists, too, on its relative lateness. In his brochure, *The Structure of Le *Livre d'Artus* and its Function in the Evolution of the Arthurian Prose Romances* (London and Paris, 1914), Sommer argues that the *Livre d'Artus* of MS 337 is derived from a romance which is also the source of the Vulgate *Merlin* and which even antedates the *Lancelot*. The argument is largely based on differences between the Vulgate *Merlin* text printed by Sommer in his *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances* on the one hand and the *Livre d'Artus* of MS 337 on the other, in passages that are obviously closely related. These differences, however, are mainly due to the fact that the author of the latter romance had a better MS of the Vulgate *Merlin* than the British Museum MS. Add. 10292 which

is virtually altogether dependent on the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation (especially II, 159) for the little that he says of him. The following are the passages concerned: VII, 15 (Pelles du roiaume de Listenois), 37 (Pelles), 146 (where he is one of the kings that sit at the Grail table), 243 (roi Pelles du chastel de Corbenic), 272 (roi Pelles du chastel de Corbenic deuers la Terre Foraine). In all these passages, except p. 146, he is barely named. I shall return to p. 146 in the discussion of Pellinor.

There is no need of giving the results of an examination of the individual passages in the prose *Tristan* relating to Pelles. They are all based on the *Queste* and *Lancelot*, Part III, and the author, of course, permits himself to embroider on the materials which he borrows. The most important alteration we find is p. 397 of Löseth's *Le Roman en prose de Tristan* (Paris, 1890)—in one of the later redactions, where Pelles is identified with the Maimed King and Galahad cures him with the bleeding lance.¹ Contrast with this, *Queste*, VI, 191, where Galahad cures the Maimed King with the lance, after Pelles, be it observed, has been required to leave the Grail Castle (p. 189).

The name of Pelles does not occur in the Didot *Perceval* nor in the *Merlin* continuation of the pseudo-Robert de Borron cycle² (best represented by the Huth *Merlin*), but in the *Queste* (represented by the Portuguese and Spanish *Demandas*) of this cycle we find him again in passages³ that are based on the *Lancelot*, Part III, and the

Sommer has printed. The *Estoire del Saint Graal*, *Mort Artu* and latter part of the *Lancelot* are all frequently abbreviated in this MS series (MSS Add. 10292–10294), and, no doubt, the same is true of the *Merlin*. Moreover, Sommer demands such a close conformity between branches as the romance-writers never concerned themselves about. I discuss this *Livre d'Artus* before the *Perlesvaus*, etc., not because I suppose it of earlier date, but because it stands closest to the Vulgate cycle in its relationships.

¹ Compare also, Löseth, *Le roman en prose de Tristan*, pp. 278 ff. (Paris, 1890), for Pelles as the Maimed King.

² An additional fragment of the *Merlin* continuation of this cycle has been printed by Sommer in *Die Abenteuer Gawains, Ywains und Le Morholts mit den drei Jungfrauen* (Halle, 1913), from MS 112 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, but this has no importance for our inquiry, since only Pellinor, of the three characters with whom we are dealing, appears in it, and of him nothing distinctive is told. I will say, by way of anticipation, however, that the Pellias of this text (well-known through Malory and Tennyson) derived his name, no doubt, from our Pellean(s), the stroke (=n) over the a being omitted.

³ Spanish *Demandas*, pp. 238 ff., 280 ff., 305 ff., in the edition of A. Bonilla y San Martín (Madrid, 1907), Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Españoles. The last of these passages (which is not in the Portuguese; see Sommer, *Romania*, XXXVI, 584), is based directly on the *Queste*, VI, 189 ff. In the others we have Pelles as the father of Galahad's mother and lord of the Adventurous Palace (Grail Castle), but the author has attached to these conceptions new inventions of his own.

Queste. He is not called here, however, either Fisher King or Maimed King.

Lastly, in the *Perlesvaus*, in which romance Perceval, of course, is again the Grail Knight, instead of Pelles' grandson Galahad, Pelles plays a subordinate part as the Hermit King and one of Perceval's three maternal uncles. The Fisher King and the wicked King of the Chastel Mortel were his brothers. The author of this romance returns to Chrétien's conception and makes the Fisher King also the Maimed King. Now, in Chrétien, ll. 6376 ff., the father of the Fisher King had a brother who was a hermit. The author of the *Perlesvaus* shifts this brother from the father, who was also maimed, to the son, and identifies him with King Pelles—hence we have in his romance, Pelles, the Hermit King. He next took Alain as the name of the father of his hero. It had been the name of the second Grail Keeper in Robert's *Joseph* and he retained very naturally as the name of the father of his Grail Knight a name that had been hallowed by earlier Grail associations.

It is useless to speculate on hypothetical lost sources as responsible for this new distribution of the Grail rôles. No writer of Arthurian romance felt himself bound by his predecessors—least of all, the author of the *Perlesvaus*, who did not hesitate to set aside the best established of all Arthurian traditions, viz., that Guinevere's adultery brought about the destruction of Arthur and his knights.¹

J. DOUGLAS BRUCE
UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

[*To be continued*]

¹ For fuller observations on this subject, cf. my article, "The Development of the Mort Arthur Theme in Mediaeval Romance," *Romanic Review*, IV, 450, note 66.

DON GARCIE AND LE MISANTHROPE

The personal element in Molière's works has been the object of so much investigation that a new article on the subject seems presumptuous, especially considering the array of critics who would be summoned as witnesses if the anonymous author of *La Fâcheuse Comédienne* could ever be haled into court to answer for libel upon Molière's wife, and should undertake to substantiate his (or her) charges by proving that they were based upon information furnished by the poet himself in his various plays.

The majority of the commentators are convinced of the truth of the statement of his early biographers, that: "Il s'est joué le premier en plusieurs endroits sur des affaires de sa famille et qui regardaient ce qui se passait dans sa domestique. C'est ce que ses plus particuliers amis ont remarqué bien des fois."¹ And, indeed, the writer of those lines should have known whereof he spoke, for it was none other than La Grange, leading actor and recorder of the troupe for so many years, evidently a man in intimate contact with Molière and enjoying his confidence and esteem.

With this as their charter, many have labored with indefatigable zeal to show the intimate connection between the incidents of the poet's own family life and the plays written at the corresponding period, particularly as they express the resultant mood of the author and his attitude toward his wife, and it must be admitted that they have collected a formidable mass of evidence. To them *Le Misanthrope* is hardly more than a thinly veiled picture of Molière's own jealousy, and Célimène a direct presentation of his wife in her own person.

To other admirers of the poet, this whole attitude is obnoxious. They, like Elise of *La Critique de l'Ecole des Femmes*, "regardent les choses du côté qu'on les leur montre, et ne les tournent point pour y chercher ce qu'il ne faut pas voir." They feel that it would have been a base act, unworthy of their favorite, to bring himself and his

¹ Quoted from Rigal, *Molière*, I, 12. See also A. Lefranc, *Revue des cours et des conférences*, XVI, 105.

private life and, worse still, his wife before the public gaze, and they resolutely close their eyes to all the similarities which one can offer them, and find no excuse in the disguise which the author has been careful to provide.

A third class believes that it was entirely natural for Molière, the great observer, to study himself and his family, just as he studied others, but that it is impossible for us to distinguish the real from the invented, or facts taken from his own experience from those gained by observation, since even his contemporaries differed in their identification of originals, and since we know from such characters as Trissotin, of *Les Femmes Savantes*, that the poet deliberately made over his models.

A few quotations will illustrate the differences of opinion regarding this point in general, and *Le Misanthrope* in particular:

The poems of Molière show us not only in uninterrupted succession the continual progress and development of the writer, they are also an exact mirror of the mental state of the man at the time of their production. In the works of no other author is the connection between the creator and his works so unmistakable as in the comedies of Molière. [Paul Lindau, *Molière, Eine Ergänzung der Biographie des Dichters aus seinen Werken* (1877), p. 3.]

For Molière to choose a lovers' quarrel so nearly resembling his own, a hero so like himself in many essentials, and a heroine who might readily pass as a portrait of his wife, and then fail to express his own wounded feelings in the lines spoken by Alceste, would be impossible if he be granted a heart. [Chatfield-Taylor, *Molière*, p. 277.]

That he put something of himself into the protesting Alceste is likely enough, just as he certainly put something of himself into Philinte, the Epicurean temporizer, content to move through life along the line of least resistance. Every artist must paint himself; and he knows others and is able to project them into independent life only because he knows himself. . . . Nothing in Molière's career leads us to suppose that he would lay bare his own life on the stage and invite the sympathy of the public for his private misfortunes. Indeed, we have every reason to believe that this is what he would never dream of doing, since it would be an act absolutely abhorrent to a man of his temperament. Self-revelation of this kind belongs to the lyric, not to the drama; and Molière had little in common with Shelley. Rather is he like Lucretius, who kept out of his lofty and austere poem every fact of his own biography. [Brander Matthews, *Molière*, pp. 110, 218, 220.]

Despois and Mesnard take a similar view regarding the impossibility of identification of the author either with Alceste or Philinte,

and insist that he was pre-eminently a painter, giving us a faithful picture of the society of the time. They admit the possibility of others finding a personal explanation for the picture here presented, though they refuse to accept the testimony of the famous libel, *La Fameuse Comédienne*, of doubtful authenticity. "En 1664, dit M. Aimé-Martin, époque à laquelle Molière travaillait au *Misanthrope*, il se sépara de sa femme, comme Alceste de Célimène, après lui avoir offert son pardon. Prenons garde toutefois que quelques vers très passionnés du rôle d'Alceste, où l'expression de sa jalousie est si pénétrante, se trouvaient déjà, comme nous l'avons rappelé plus haut, dans une pièce représentée en février 1661, un an avant le mariage de Molière, ajoutons composée depuis longtemps."

This warning is qualified by the admission that many of these fine verses are not in *Don Garcie* and that Alceste is unhappy in a different way from Don Garcie and suffers from a coquetry which is only too real. They continue: "Pourquoi donc ne pas admettre que le poète a été inspiré par ses propres chagrins? La conjecture, en effet, n'est pas à répousser, si l'on n'y dépasse pas la juste mesure."¹

Rigal is more positive as to the importance to be attached to the lines occurring in *Don Garcie*:

En somme, de tant de suppositions échafaudées sur la carrière théâtrale d'Armande, il ne reste guère debout que celle qui concerne les rôles d'Alceste et de Célimène dans *Le Misanthrope*, et celle-ci même, hélas! est d'une solidité fort douteuse. Parmi les vers les plus caractéristiques de l'atrabilaire amoureux et de la coquette, beaucoup, en 1666, ont été repris par Molière dans son *Don Garcie de Navarre* de 1661, antérieur de plus d'un an à son mariage. Vous avez cru tout à l'heure que je citais quatre vers du *Misanthrope*; j'ai cité quatre vers de *Don Garcie*.²

Other quotations might be given, principally from those who find close agreement between the facts of the author's life and the incidents, characterization, and meaning of his plays. They would, so it seems to me, at least, prove that this relation does exist, and that it is not merely a pleasant, though futile, exercise of wit to seek it out; rather that it throws new light on many points.³

¹ Despoin and Mesnard, *Grands Ecrivains* edition of Molière, V, 385-86.

² Rigal, *Molière*, I, 28.

³ Among the noteworthy studies of this kind, in addition to the works already quoted, are those of Schneegans, *Molière* (Berlin, 1902), which offers invaluable information and comment on all the plays, and to which is to be added his previous article on *Molières Subjektivismus*, *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Literaturgeschichte*, XV, 407; and his reply to criticism, in *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie*, XXVII, 275 ff.; the

It would seem, for instance, that the relation between the two plays of *Le Misanthrope* and *Don Garcie* had not been sufficiently studied, since Rigal's argument, above quoted, is advanced long after Despois and Mesnard had admitted that many of the fine verses of *Le Misanthrope* are not to be found in the previous play, and that Alceste, who suffers from a coquetry that is only too real, is unhappy in a different way from Don Garcie.¹

The purpose of this paper, then, has been to compare the plays more closely, to study the lines which are identical, and to see what bearing they have on the play of *Le Misanthrope* as a whole. Inasmuch as there appeared to be a decided change in the author's attitude in at least one aspect, it became of importance to examine the intervening plays for any evidence as to the time of this change, and to see whether or not a gradual development could be noted.

It will hardly fall within the bounds of this study, therefore, to take up the arguments advanced by the dissenters to the theory that Molière should have put himself, and his wife, and his own deep emotions into his plays. For him the dramatic form was the medium of self-expression, just as for another it is the lyric. Even a critic, in his interpretations, must be influenced to some extent by his personal experience and by the analysis of his own sentiments, and put these into his studies.² It is well known that Molière did not hesitate to allude to himself, his own peculiarities and those of his comrades, in some plays; this was a recognized procedure in the old farces which were the foundation of his dramatic system;³ why should he not have taken the characters and incidents which were about him as the material with which to work? The material thus obtained he disguised, combining real traits from one person with those from

reviews by Ph. Aug. Becker, in *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Literaturgeschichte*, XVI, 194–221, and Vossler, *Archiv für das Studium der neu. Spr. u. Lit.*, CVIII, 461, in which they protest against the emphasis on the subjective element in Molière, as does Rigal in the introduction to his volume already referred to. The prefaces to the various plays in the *Grands Écrivains* edition should be consulted in each case. Of prime importance, also, are the *compte-rendus* of the course of Professor Abel Lefranc, given at the Collège de France, published in *La Revue des cours et des conférences* (Paris, 1906–10), especially XIV, 19 ff., and XVI, 104 ff. 161 ff. J. Loiseleur, *Les Points obscurs de la vie de Molière* (Paris, 1877), is one of the well-known exponents of the subjective point of view.

¹ One should compare, however, the statement in the introduction to the consideration of *Le Misanthrope* (Rigal, *Molière*, II, 45): "Il est naturel qu'elle se ressentit des dispositions de Molière à cette date, d'autant que Célimène, la coquette qui, dans la comédie, faisait souffrir Alceste, devait être jouée par Armande, et que le jaloux grondeur, Alceste, devait être joué par Molière lui-même."

² Anatole France, *La Vie littéraire*, I, préface, p. iv.

³ Lanson, "Molière et la Farce," *Revue de Paris*, VIII, 3, p. 129.

another, and with some which he found in books or invented. No one was exempt, yet he might always deny complete identity. And we will assume that in *Le Misanthrope*, as in other plays, he might have introduced, either consciously or without deliberate intention, some elements of his own recent experiences with society, particularly with the passions of love and jealousy.

What, then, is to be done with the portion of the play taken from *Don Garcie*? Did the author take over lines which he felt were particularly well turned, and make a place for them in *Le Misanthrope*, in order that they might not be lost in a play which had proved an utter failure? Shall we not rather say that he was merely following his well-known custom of taking his "bien" where he found it?¹ In some cases the wording has been changed a little, a thing any author would do in revising, and in most, if not all, these verbal differences one discerns an improvement.

Does it follow, then, from the use of this material, amounting to some one hundred and fifteen lines, taken almost verbatim from several passages in the earlier comedy to make up half the verses in two scenes (IV, 2 and 3) of *Le Misanthrope*,² that, if the true sentiments of the poet have been expressed in one of the plays, the same must be true of the other, and that, if the former cannot be a reflection of Molière's actual feelings toward Armande, since it was written before his marriage, then the second passage cannot be, either? Such a conclusion would be unfounded. For one thing, the passion of jealousy was a favorite one with the poet. Professor Lefranc has very clearly shown how it permeates all his plays,³ and this is natural, since it was a popular theme among the old writers of farces and fabliaux. Moreover, Molière may well have experienced it at the time of the writing of *Don Garcie*. It would have been the same passion whether felt for Armande or another, and our playwright was not above suspicion as regards intrigues with the actresses of his troupe. This supposition, however, is unnecessary, and the jealousy

¹ Despois and Mesnard in a note to *Don Garcie* (II, 300, note) quote the four lines from Bélisaire introduced there by the poet, and remark: "ces réminiscences assez insignifiantes d'ailleurs, devaient être toutes naturelles et presque toujours involontaires chez un comédien dont le mémoire était remplie de souvenirs de ce genre." May not this explanation be applicable also to the lines, more numerous, it is true, which Molière has taken from his own previous play to use in *Le Misanthrope*?

² *Grands Ecrivains*, V, 518-28; II, *Don Garcie*, *passim*.

³ *Revue des cours et des conférences*, XVI, 97.

of the play which was first produced in 1661, though the lines were written before, according to the statement of Somaize,¹ may really refer to the author's sentiments toward Armande at that time. It was in 1661 that he obtained the grant of an additional share in the profits of his company, for himself, or for his wife if he should marry. The investigations of Professor Lefranc would show that his interest in Armande can be traced back as early as 1659, if she is the one referred to in the letter of Chapelle, which some deny.² Is it not natural to suppose, with our knowledge of Armande's character as it was later disclosed, that, even at this time, her lover may have felt the pangs of jealousy?

The general tone of the first play is in accord with this hypothesis. It is decidedly more romantic. Our dramatist is making an excursion into the field of heroic comedy, and deals with Spanish princes and infantas, who speak in a *précieux* style, and have Cornelian ideas of duty and honor. This characteristic is in marked contrast with the play of *Sganarelle*, or *Le Cocu imaginaire*, which preceded *Don Garcie*, the theme of which is jealousy, but in low station. It is noteworthy that here, as in *Don Garcie*, we have jealousy based upon unfounded suspicions due to deceptive appearances.

In the heroic comedy the action turns upon a series of passionate outbursts on the part of the suspicious Prince of Navarre. He thinks continually he has cause to suspect the fidelity of his lady love, Doña Elvire, who is really most devoted to him and resents, with all the violence of outraged innocence, the insult of his doubting her after she has condescended to let him see that she cares for him. Appearances are always against the lady; first, it is the torn half of a letter, really intended for Don Garcie, but supposed by him to have been addressed to a rival, which occasions his reproaches; next, the sudden discovery of this rival with Doña Elvire; then, a glimpse of the latter in the arms of a man—who turns out to be a distressed damsel in disguise. The spectator has been shown each time the occasion for the suspicions of the lover, and sees that they are not unnatural, but he knows at the same time that the sweetheart is innocent. The play ends with a marriage, the lady yielding to the conviction that

¹ Quoted in Introduction, *Grands Ecrivains*, II, 220-21.

² *Revue des cours et des conférences*, XVI, 161.

her lover is suffering from a malady which it is not in his power to overcome, and is therefore not to be blamed.

Surely, if Molière were wooing Armande at this period, the idea presented was well calculated to excuse him for any jealous suspicions he might have shown, and win her consent to follow the example of the heroine and forgive. Throughout the play the man is admittedly wrong, and on the defensive, while the woman, we are made to see, may be innocent, no matter how strong the circumstantial evidence against her.

The tone is entirely different in *Le Misanthrope*. Here, it is the woman who is on the defensive. She uses exactly the same arguments as Elvira—namely, the indignation of offended innocence; insistence that any doubt on the part of her lover, after her intimation that she loves him, is an insult; the declaration that she repudiates all she has ever said or done to encourage him—yet, in spite of these pleas, she is proved guilty of falsehood and insincerity. May not the poet's choice of identical arguments be significant? We may sympathize to some extent with Célimène's resentment at the irritable, overbearing manner of her lover, but we also sympathize with him. His love is sincere, and we see that he is right in distrusting her. His is a fault of manner, hers a vice of character.

Even the context in which the identical passages are placed, and the verbal changes in the verses themselves, lend a note of greater sincerity to the rather artificial speeches of the hero. I should be tempted to distrust my own judgment as to this, but a note of Despois and Mesnard, who set down all resemblances and identical passages in the two plays with scrupulous accuracy, bears me out.¹

¹ Note to line 573 of *Don Garcie*. I cite first the passage to which the note refers for purposes of comparison:

Don Garcie: Encore est-ce beaucoup que, de franchise pure,
Vous demeurez d'accord que c'est votre écriture.

Mais ce sera, sans doute, et j'en serois garant,
Un billet qu'on envoie à quelque indifférent;
Ou du moins, ce qu'il a de tendresse évidente,
Sera pour une amie, ou pour quelque parente.

Doña Elvire: Non, c'est pour un amant que ma main l'a formé,
Et j'ajoute de plus, pour un amant aimé.

Note. Ce qui est ici une ironie amère devient dans *Le Misanthrope* un mouvement de sensibilité touchante:

"De grace, montrez-moi, je serai satisfait,
Qu'on peut pour une femme expliquer ce billet."

Et Célimène répond avec le même sentiment de fierté blessé, mais avec beaucoup moins de sincérité qu'Elvire:

"Non, il est pour Oronte et je veux qu'on le croie."

Of course this increased naturalness is due in part to the fact that the master's dramatic technique has improved in the meantime, and due weight must be given this point. I need not dwell on the many superiorities of *Le Misanthrope* over *Don Garcie*: the advantage gained by showing Alceste in contact with the world, and presenting other phases of his character; the heightening of the impression by the introduction of contrasting characters, such as Philinte, and Eliante, and Arsinoé. Because of them, Alceste's blunt and dictatorial manner is brought into greater relief, and Célimène also appears in clearer light, for she is more sympathetic than the mischief-making and scandal-seeking prude who criticizes her, and less admirable, by far, than her more reasonable, but less dashing and popular cousin, emphasizing thus the poet's doctrine, that "la raison n'est pas ce qui règle l'amour."

To elaborate this theme would tend to obscure the other question I have in mind, whether the intervening plays, which show the author's growing aesthetic power, offer also any indication of a change in his attitude toward life which would explain this deeper personal note and keener understanding of the passion he depicts. To my mind, there is ample justification for the conclusions of the many critics who find clear evidence of continual allusions to the dramatist's emotional experiences at this eventful time.¹ But it does not seem to me that direct reference to events of the poet's real life must be established for all of his productions in order to maintain the validity of my argument.

It will be sufficient to summarize briefly my conclusions with regard to each play, without attempting to burden the discussion with long quotations, inasmuch as the force of the argument lies in the general point of view of the author, in each play, rather than in detached scenes and speeches. Moreover, it hardly appears necessary to take up the plays which precede *Don Garcie*, unless perhaps it be *Les Précieuses ridicules*, since, in *L'Etourdi* and in *Le Dépit amoureux*, Molière was following very closely the tradition of the Italian comedy of intrigue. There is a vividness and a naturalness

¹ Compare the works already cited, especially Schneegans, Rigal, Chatfield-Taylor, and Lefranc. The latter says (*Revue des cours et des conférences*, XVI, 105): "Ainsi le rapport entre les sentiments du poète et ses pièces est incontestable; jamais d'ailleurs, il ne fut aussi saisissant que dans les années qui nous occupent en ce moment (1660-64)."

about the episode of the lover's tiff which bespeak keen observation but not necessarily personal experience, and I see no definite connection with the specific point under discussion. In the *Précieuses*, Molière has utilized the procedure of the old farce in retaining the names of his actors for his personnages.¹ Is it possible to add that he may have been satirizing the efforts of his two leading ladies, newly returned from the provinces, to ape the fine manners of Paris society? This would be tempting, but only a conjecture. The most we can say is that it indicates a willingness on the part of the poet to make use of his immediate company and surroundings to furnish realistic detail, a means which he continued to employ.

In *L'Ecole des Maris*, 1661, which followed *Don Garcie* after only a few months' interval, and preceded the marriage of Molière by a short time, there appears to be a direct plea to Armande, in the favorable presentation of the young ward, who formed an attachment for her old guardian, because of his kind treatment and his sympathetic understanding of a young girl's interests and her natural fondness for dress and society. Similarly, our sympathy is won for her sister, who deceived her exacting, ill-tempered guardian, whose faith was only in bolts and bars and severe repression, and ran off with a young lover. One would say that this implies, on Molière's part, a recognition of the kind of treatment which his bride would have a right to expect, and also his intention to act the generous guardian and not make himself ridiculous.

Les Fâcheux, which is next in order, offers no more than a passing allusion to jealousy; there is, perhaps, a trace of the poet's own vexation with the bores who interfered with his courtship.²

L'Ecole des Femmes has occasioned almost as much controversy as *Le Misanthrope* over the matter of the author's self-revelation. Note that in this play again we sympathize with the girl, and that the brisk, overbearing, jealous man is made ridiculous, though, here and there, one seems to catch a note of underlying sympathy with his

¹ See Lanson, "Molière et la Farce," *Revue de Paris*, VIII, 3, p. 129.

² Cf. N. M. Bernardin, *Les Chefs du Chœur* (Paris, 1914), p. 110: "Et elle m'intéresse encore, cette jolie scène (Acte II, les deux fâcheuses), parceque Molière, le jaloux Molière, qui a écrit *Don Garcie de Navarre* et qui écrira *Le Misanthrope*, y adresse, pardessus la tête des deux marquises, à la jeune fille, qui dans quelques mois sera sa femme, cet hémistiche plein de passion; 'Le jaloux aime plus.'"

sufferings. It may mark the preoccupation of the author regarding his fate as husband, as most critics appear to admit; but, to my mind, the tone of the play is not that of the disappointed, jealous husband, but, rather, one of security and jesting, as though Molière were fore-stalling taunting allusions to the inequality in age by being the first to heap ridicule upon the old fellow who either believes that he can win the affection of a young girl against her will, or trusts to ignorance or force to guarantee a woman's virtue. Arnolphe, in his passionate outbursts, may betray the capacity of emotion of his creator, but the figure lacks the bitterness of later plays. Arnolphe is a more ridiculous figure than Alceste, and, as I have said, we justify Agnes in her action, and so does Molière in this play, as he did the similar situation in *L'Ecole des Maris*. We may say that Molière feels that his wife is not the "sotte" Agnes, and he does not intend to be the domineering, exacting Sganarelle, nor Arnolphe, though he might be somewhat impatient at times.¹

The little play of *La Critique de l'Ecole des Femmes* offers us Molière's wife in the rôle of a young woman of society, clever and sarcastic, whose tone reminds one decidedly of Célimène in the scene with the prude.

The same year, in *L'Impromptu de Versailles* (III, 392) we see Armande intrusted again with a similar rôle by her husband-director, and actually brought on the stage in her own name, in company with the other actors, in dress rehearsal. There, too, we have the famous tiff between her and Molière which merits citation here. Armande has interrupted the rehearsal, and Molière says:

"Taisez-vous, ma femme, vous êtes une bête."

Mlle de Molière: "Grand merci, monsieur mon mari. Voilà ce que c'est! Le mariage change bien les gens, et vous ne m'auriez pas dit cela il y a dix-huit mois."

¹ Cf. Bernardin, *Les Chefs du Théâtre*, p. 143: "Non, Molière n'a pas voulu faire plaindre Arnolphe, ce qui irait contre la thèse qu'il soutient; seulement il était lui-même porté à la jalousie; il en avait souffert; il se rappelait des heures cruelles encore au souvenir. Il a donc mis quelquechose de son propre cœur dans la douleur de son personnage; une goutte du sang de Molière est tombée dans l'encre avec laquelle il a écrit cette scène si profondément humaine, mais elle n'en est pas moins, dans son ensemble, une pure scène de comédie." Cf. Schneegans, *op. cit.*, pp. 89, 93; Chatfield-Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 163-65 (as usual, the latter finds more direct allusion to the author); Rigal, *op. cit.*, I, 157-53, gives a reasonable explanation, without this subjective element. See also Lefranc, *op. cit.*

Molière: "Taisez-vous, je vous prie."

Mlle de Molière: "C'est une chose étrange qu'une petite cérémonie soit capable de nous ôter toutes nos belles qualités, et qu'un mari et un galant regardent la même personne avec des yeux si différents."

Molière: "Que de discours!"

Mlle de Molière: "Ma foi, si je faisais une comédie, je la ferais sur ce sujet. Je justifierais les femmes de bien des choses dont on les accuse; et je ferais craindre aux maris la différence qu'il y a de leurs manières brusques, aux civilités des galants."

Note that the lines indicate in Armande a type of character very similar to that of Célimène, fully capable of bringing home to her husband her disapproval of the change in his manner since the days when he was a lover. In Molière, a sharpness and impatience is shown which resembles that of Alceste.

In *Le Mariage Forcé* (scene ii) there is a cynical attitude toward the coming relations between the elderly husband, who is made ridiculous, and the notorious young flirt, who gives him plainly to understand that she sees in marriage an opportunity of gratifying her fondness for "gambling, visiting, assemblies, entertainments, promenades, in fact all kinds of pleasures," and that she knows he will not be so foolish as to be jealous. The note in this play is very bitter, and its date, just before the first three acts of *Tartuffe*, in 1664, corresponds with the period at which, according to Brossette, the dramatist was at work on the first act of *Le Misanthrope*.

The *Princesse d'Elide*, which immediately precedes *Tartuffe*, offers no apparent relation to contemporary incident or to Armande.

In the *Tartuffe*, Elmire appears as one of Molière's most estimable female characters. How can this be reconciled with our theory? In the first place, we do not contend, as I have said before, that allusions to Armande are to be found in all of the plays. The poet may have desired to show that he realized that the other type of woman existed, as he does in Eliante of *Le Misanthrope*. But there are certain points deserving of attention on the other side. Elmira is called a coquette by some commentators, and, though I do not agree with them (it would be better for my argument if I did), she is evidently fond of dress and society, and justifies to some extent their accusation. Grimarest reports a rebuke administered to Armande by her husband because of her elaborate costumes in this

play. Furthermore, may not Elmire's speech, which sets forth the inadvisability of troubling a husband with any of the silly actions of a lover,¹ present Armande's own views, and the whole episode indicate a willingness on the part of the author to accept his wife's explanations, to reject slander and to admit again her possible innocence, just as Alceste offers to accept Célimène's explanation of the letter?

It was just after this period that Armande's indiscretions were most talked about, and her name coupled with those of various young nobles. Did this have anything to do with choice of the playwright's next theme, *Don Juan*, the seducer? Possibly not; this choice may be perfectly well explained on other grounds, but it is at least suggestive. The play contains, you will recall, another of Molière's sympathetic women characters, perhaps the most idealistic of them all, Doña Elvire. Probably it was not her rôle which was played by Molière's wife, but that of Charlotte, the peasant girl, who is willing to desert her humble lover for the bold betrayer.

L'Amour Médecin also intervenes before the completed *Misanthrope*, which was not presented until 1666, although it may have been begun in 1664. This little comedy-ballet, satirizing the court physicians, affords us no new arguments. We sympathize with the girl, who deceives her father in order to wed the man of her choice, but it is her father's gullibility in matters of medicine which is most stressed, together with the charlatanry of the doctors of that day.

This brings us to *Le Misanthrope*, in which, as in the preceding plays, the reproachful, intemperate, jealous lover, is made ridiculous. But in Alceste the ridicule is on the surface; one cannot fail to recognize the noble qualities and suffering heart beneath. Less attention was paid by the author before to developing this feature, though glimpses of a tragic undercurrent are to be caught in Arnolphe of *L'Ecole des Femmes*, and in the bitter deception of the weak and burlesque Sganarelle of *Le Mariage Forcé*; and there is a brief, but

¹ *Le Tartuffe*, acte II, scène 5:

"Oui, je tiens que jamais de tous ces vains propos,
On ne doit d'un mari traverser le repos,
Que ce n'est point de là que l'honneur peut dépendre,
Et qu'il suffit pour nous de savoir nous défendre;
Ce sont mes sentiments; et vous n'auriez rien dit,
Damis, si j'avais eu sur vous quelque crédit."

vigorous, manly protest against his calumniators, voiced by the poet speaking in his own name, in *L'Impromptu de Versailles*.

The spectator's sympathy has heretofore been drawn to the heroine in her contest with her uncompromising or distrustful lover or guardian in almost every case except in *Le Misanthrope* (save in *Le Mariage Forcé*, where her rôle is but a small one). Some resemblance to Célimène is to be found in the sarcastic marquise of the *Critique de l'Ecole des Femmes*, in Armande's own part in *L'Impromptu de Versailles*, and, possibly, in Elmire of *Tartuffe*, and in Dorimène of *Le Mariage Forcé*. On the whole, the tone is more or less sympathetic with the fondness of the girl for dress, society, and diversions, until *Le Misanthrope*. May this not mean that here, also, we are to sympathize with Célimène against Alceste, in the superficial things, while we condemn her heart? May it not mean, furthermore, that the poet, after sympathizing with Armande and trying to justify her, saw, at last, her insincerity and fickleness, and allowed his resentment to appear in this form?

Sufficient probability has been established, or so it seems to me, for us to conclude that the lines taken over from *Don Garcie* to make one of the episodes of *Le Misanthrope* not only do not prove that the jealousy of Alceste is not that of the poet, since he might have experienced the passion even at the time of *Don Garcie*, but, on the other hand, they suggest more forcibly the change in domestic conditions, inasmuch as in this play the suspicions of the lover are justified. This change of viewpoint seems to be contemporaneous with the poet's marital infelicity, and would plainly seem to be an outcome of it. Hints of it, and allusions to characteristics of Armande, which are similar to those of Célimène, appear in some of the comedies before *Le Misanthrope*, and make it more probable that she was really in the poet's mind as he wrote.

Is this too subjective? Or may one say that it is not all mere assumption, and that Rigal, in the passage previously quoted, and Brander Matthews in the lines given below,¹ attach too much

¹ Brander Matthews, *Molière*, p. 219: "One reason why so many of his critics and commentators have insisted upon identifying him more often with Alceste than with any other of his creatures is their belief that the relations of Molière to his wife at the time when this comedy was composed are reflected in the play. Their contention is that they overhear an echo of Molière's appeal to Armande Béjart, in the reproaches Alceste (which he acted) addresses to Célimène (which she acted). But this is sheer assumption,

importance to the verses which were taken from *Don Garcie*, and try to diminish too severely Molière's tendency to self-revelation?¹

This self-revelation, under the disguise in which it appears, need have nothing abhorrent or displeasing. Its effect, it seems to me, should be to make *Le Misanthrope* more profound, more significant, because of its background of real emotional experience. To be complete, a similar study should be made of the plays from *Le Misanthrope* to *Le Malade Imaginaire*. I hope shortly to publish the results of an investigation which appears to confirm the theory that the changes in the author's home life found their echo also in these plays.

CASIMIR DOUGLASS ZDANOWICZ

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

unsupported by the facts; and it is significant that certain of the speeches in which Alceste voices his despairing jealousy and which sound as if they had been wrung from Molière's own heart at this moment of anguish when he and his wife were living apart, were not written originally for the *Misanthrope* but for *Don Garcie*, produced long before his marriage. This unsuccessful play had never been published, and its author held himself at liberty to use its fragments again not only in the *Misanthrope* but in others of his later plays."

¹ The claim of Boileau that Molière admitted that Alceste was modeled after him in some particulars, and the story of a similar identification with Montausier, do not preclude the interpretation here suggested. It was Molière's custom, when he took characters from real life, to disguise them, to combine in one person qualities or traits taken from several, thereby throwing off the track those who were continually seeking to identify the originals, and preserving an alibi for himself, and, at the same time, offering more complete patterns, or types, of the vice he was satirizing, or presenting such inconsistencies as made the personage more human. One may even think of him as setting himself the problem of indicating how a Boileau or a Montausier would feel and act in situations analogous to those in which he found himself, or how Armande would have acted in certain conditions. But this is going far afield into the realms of subjective reverie, from which it has been the endeavor to keep the argument free.

THE FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES OF LAMARTINE

The object of this article is to gather together scattered data in regard to the financial record of Lamartine, and to use these facts as a basis for a brief discussion of the causes which led up to the unfortunate financial condition of the poet in his old age. The following unpublished letter, in the handwriting of Mlle Valentine de Cessia de Lamartine, the niece of the poet, may serve as a starting-point for this discussion. This letter was written when Lamartine was seventy-four years of age, and is typical of the other letters of this period.

PARIS, 5 décembre, 1864

M. de Lamartine, dépouillé cette année par la partialité de l'Angleterre, de la fortune de sa femme, qui devait l'aider à désintéresser ses créanciers, est obligé plus que jamais de recourir aux deux honorables ressources qui ne lui ont jamais manqué: son travail et votre amitié.

Il vous prie en conséquence de lui renvoyer le plus promptement possible, le mandat d'abonnement ci joint signé de vous.

ALPH. DE LAMARTINE

43, RUE DE LA VILLE L'ÉVÈQUE¹

The finances of Lamartine were in a deplorable condition at the time the above letter was written; a condition which was not the result of a few years of misfortune but was the culmination of years of ill-regulated expenditure. It is necessary, in order to have a clear understanding of the situation in which we find Lamartine at this advanced age, to study the entire history of his finances, a study which can be best made through his correspondence. The most of the important letters from 1807 to 1852 are of easy access in the collection published by his niece, Mlle Valentine de Cessia, under the title, *Correspondance de Lamartine*;² but those letters which deal

¹ The above letter was attached to the back of the title-page of an edition of the *Oeuvres complètes* of Lamartine, purchased by the University of Illinois Library in 1915. The first volume of this edition contains the autograph of the author—*Mémoire et reconnaissance, Lamartine*—written on the fly-leaf. No evidence of the previous publication of this letter has been found in the individual letters or in the various collections of letters that have been consulted.

² *Correspondance de Lamartine*, publiée par Mme Valentine de Lamartine, 4 vols., Paris, 1881-82 (second edition).

with the last seventeen years of the poet's life are less easily available, as they are scattered in different collections.

Three words from the foregoing letter—*désintéresser ses créanciers*—might well serve as a key to the financial record of his life, since at no time does Lamartine seem to be completely free from debt. As a youth, he received frequent aid from the private purse of his mother, and as a young man of twenty-nine we find him complaining in a letter to a youthful friend, Mlle Eléonore de Canonge, of his harassing debts, a complaint which he terminates with the prophetic statement so applicable to his later life: "Quand on a mis, en commençant sa route, le pied dans cette maudite boue, on ne s'en retire jamais totalement."¹ He was relieved of the debts in question through the indulgence of an uncle and two aunts—*d l'insu même de mon père*, he adds.

The gifts made him by his father, and his uncles and aunts, at the time of his marriage in 1820, together with the available portion of the dowry of his bride,² furnished him with a comfortable income, which, however, was insufficient to meet his expenditures, especially during his diplomatic career in Italy. The famous Oriental trip in 1832-33, which lasted sixteen months, was the cause of an additional burden on his budget. The expensive nature of this undertaking may be judged from the fact that he chartered for this voyage an entire boat at a rate of approximately three thousand francs a month. It must be confessed that this expense weighed but lightly upon him, for in writing to his friend the comte de Virieu, he ends the description of this transaction with the nonchalant statement: "C'est prodigieusement peu pour un beau navire."³ Three months later it is a caravan of sixty to one hundred men, with the necessary complement of horses, mules, etc., which he acquires for his service, again with the modest statement: "Cet immense attirail de choses . . . n'est pas énormément cher."⁴ The other expenses of the trip are in proportion. It is only just to state, on the other hand, that

¹ Letter of October 8, 1819, *Correspondance*, II, 77.

² See article of M. René Doumic (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, September-October, 1905, p. 171).

³ Letter of June 25, 1832, *Correspondance*, III, 281.

⁴ Letter of September 6, 1832, *Correspondance*, III, 292.

the cost of this trip was made up, three years later, by the publication and sale of the *Voyage en Orient*.

The strain imposed upon his finances by this voyage was increased by a succession of financial misfortunes which caused him to write, three years later: "J'ai perdu tous mes capitaux disponibles dans des banqueroutes, des entreprises mal exécutées, en Amérique, et dans une grêle qui vient de ravager entièrement mes propriétés où j'avais mis des avances énormes; je dois beaucoup et je ne puis vendre."¹ The same state of affairs exists in 1841, for we find him seeking, in that year, a loan of 200,000 francs on two of his estates valued at 1,400,000 francs, and which are already mortgaged for 465,000 francs.²

The reasons for this indebtedness, as well as that of later years, are not difficult to discover. In the first place, Lamartine, with the exception of his last few years, always lived the life of a rich nobleman, surrounding himself with beautiful things: horses, dogs, books, works of art. "Les chevaux ! autre bénédiction de la vie, qui me soulage un peu. J'en ai de charmants et en bon nombre," he writes to a friend in 1837, in the same letter in which he acknowledges: "J'ai cinq ou six ans très-étroits à traverser, plus d'argent et des charges viagères énormes!"³ The expenses of this luxurious life could have been met by the income from his books, if he had been willing to devote himself to literature alone. Unfortunately, the desire for a more active life carried him into other fields, in which he was less successful. In business affairs he was possessed with an innate fondness for taking chances, although he writes emphatically a propos of his real estate transactions in Asia: "Je ne fais pas de spéculations, je les ai en horreur."⁴ One form of speculation in which he indulged was that of purchasing the growing crops of neighboring vine-growers, in order to use them as security for loans, transactions in which he lost large sums by the depreciation in price of the crops or their destruction by storms or plant diseases. A good description of one of these dealings is given in his *Mémoires politiques*,

¹ *Correspondance*, III, 367.

² *Ibid.*, IV, 104.

³ Letter of September 29, 1837, *Correspondance*, III, 433.

⁴ Letter of April 14, 1850, *Correspondance*, IV, 312.

when in 1849 the vine-growers of his neighborhood offered him their crops on credit to help him meet his debts. He says: "J'acceptai avec attendrissement. Je fixai moi-même le prix de ces vins largement aussi; je les revendis à perte aux marchands qui prenaient mes propres récoltes, et je vécus ainsi sur un fonds de roulement emprunté et commode, dont je me rendais un compte approximatif et inexact."¹

Other financial burdens which Lamartine imposed upon himself originated from a desire to keep the ancestral estates together, and to become a great land-owner. With these objects in view, he purchased the shares of his sisters in the family lands, and spent large sums of money for their improvement, and in the purchase of nearby land, only to find that the revenues from the properties were insufficient to meet the costs.

Year after year the struggle continues. A sale of personal property—horses, books, pictures—and unencumbered lands, in 1844, together with 250,000 francs obtained the following year from the sale of the copyright for twelve years of *Les Girondins*,² gave him hope of complete liquidation within three years. This hope was deceived, for in 1849, when he retired from active political life, after passing rapidly from the greatest public favor to the greatest degree of unpopularity, he found himself hopelessly involved.³ His popularity during the troublous times of the revolution of 1848, in which he played so important a rôle, was costly; M. Edouard Grenier in his *Souvenirs littéraires* informs us that Mme de Lamartine admitted to him one day that their charities for a few months alone in this year had exceeded 100,000 francs.⁴

Lamartine's acts of charity were many, for one of the most attractive qualities of the poet was his kindness of heart and open-handed generosity. Frequent accounts occur of the ready help which he extended to colleagues and friends, even in his later years of misfortune.⁵ On the other hand, some of his gifts may be regarded as a

¹ *Oeuvres complètes de Lamartine* (Paris, 1860-63), XL. 64.

² *Correspondance*, IV, 208.

³ See article by M. Léon Séché in the *Revue des Français*, April, 1911, p. 273.

⁴ *Souvenirs littéraires*, par Edouard Grenier (Paris, 1894), p. 27.

⁵ See article entitled "Lamartine et l'école romantique," by M. Léon Séché (*Annales Romantiques*, II, 312).

mixture of charity and polities, such as the donations of his earlier years described by him in a letter to his intimate friend, the comte de Virieu, in which he announces his defeat in an election at Mâcon:—"Or je ne crois pas qu'il y ait une condition plus populaire que la mienne à Mâcon . . . j'ai fait pour 40,000 francs de routes à mes frais, j'ai donné 2,000 francs au choléra; j'ai donné cette année 25,000 francs de livres à la Bibliothèque de la ville, etc., etc., etc.; j'ai marché à la tête de la garde nationale, etc., etc., etc."¹ The result of all these efforts he announced earlier in the letter: "J'ai été ballotté avec un serrurier tapageur, et le serrurier a été nommé!" In the *Correspondance* for 1848, we find, similarly, a letter to the mayor of Mâcon in which Lamartine promises a subscription of five thousand francs toward the establishment in that city of a *comptoir d'escompte*, and also sends two thousand francs to be distributed for charitable purposes among the workingmen of the city; these gifts are accompanied by the request that the mayor announce the fact in the newspaper of Mâcon.²

At the end of his political career, Lamartine, in order to recoup his losses, turns to his Asiatic estate near Smyrna, which the sultan, Abdul Medjid, had given him. We find him still optimistic in spite of his many failures—fortune is still just a step ahead of him. After visiting this great estate, he writes to one of his friends: "C'est véritablement la *Limage d'Asie*, il y a la fortune sous quarante ou cinquante formes,"³ and a letter of the following day to another friend is equally enthusiastic:—"Je suis ébloui. Il y a la fortune de cent spéculateurs et de mille agriculteurs."⁴ Unfortunately, men with capital did not share his enthusiasm. He returned empty-handed from a trip to London in search of capital, although he writes with some gratification: "La cité a voulu me recevoir en banquet à Covent-Garden," and adds the somewhat surprising detail: "Les chemins de fer et les paquebots et les hôtels sur la route n'ont pas voulu recevoir un shelling de moi, disant que j'étais l'hôte de l'Angleterre pacifique."⁵

¹ Letter of June 22, 1837, *Correspondance*, III, 427.

² Letter of March, 1848, *Correspondance*, IV, 277.

³ Letter of July 16, 1850, *Correspondance*, IV, 320.

⁴ Letter of July 17, 1850, *Correspondance*, IV, 321.

⁵ *Correspondance*, IV, 334-35.

The *coup d'état* which placed Napoleon III on the throne in 1852 was an additional blow to Lamartine, particularly because a ban was placed on the publication of his popular political paper, *Le Conseiller du peuple*, which had a subscription list of eighty thousand names. It was at this time that he felt obliged to leave his beautiful apartment, 82 rue de l'Université, in order to make his home at the address indicated in the letter printed above, in a gloomy *rez-de-chaussée*, at the rear of the courtyard. Three rooms were retained for house-keeping while the rest of the apartment was turned into a combined bookstore and printing establishment, where our author edited and published, himself, various works, including the forty-volume edition of his *Oeuvres complètes*,¹ which bears as evidence on its title-page the words: "Chez l'auteur, rue de la Ville L'Evêque, 43."²

Misfortunes continue steadily during the next decade, and in 1860 the beloved family estate of Milly is sold.³ Lamartine is now seventy years of age, yet in spite of illness he struggles on courageously for several years, but with little hope of relief. The twenty-fourth of November, 1864, just eleven days before the date of our letter, the fact that he appreciates the hopelessness of his condition is indicated by the following words in a letter to his friend, the baron de Chamborant: "L'heure de mon dépouillement absolu approche: à peine ai-je le temps de réfléchir au coup qui nous menace. J'ai eu cependant des créanciers obligeants et de très belles récoltes. Mais la destinée est plus forte que la Providence."⁴ His main hope at this time was in a great number of subscriptions to the edition of his *Oeuvres complètes*, in behalf of which the letter at the beginning of this article was written, but the public was no longer interested in the writer, and the edition did not find many subscribers.

¹ The part which Mme de Lamartine took, as proofreader, in the publication of this edition is described in an interesting manner by M. Charles Alexandre in an article in *Le Correspondant*, September 10, 1884.

² This apartment, with its contents, was disposed of by public sale in 1867, two years before the death of its owner, to meet a mortgage held by the Crédit Foncier. Lamartine at that time was lodged in a villa, avenue de l'Empereur (now number 109, avenue Henri-Martin), a lodging granted to him in 1860 by the city of Paris and occupied by him until his death.

³ In his article entitled "Sur un Manuscrit de Lamartine" (*Les Annales Romantiques*, IX [1912], 152), M. Louis Barthou publishes a list of debts drawn up by Lamartine, February 19, 1859, which shows a deficit of over two million francs.

⁴ *Lamartine inconnu*, par A. de Chamborant de Périsat (Paris, 1891), p. 268.

The last letter from which quotations may be made to complete this portion of the financial history was written at Paris, August 1, 1866, not long before the illness which deprived the poet, for the remainder of his life, of the free use of his faculties. This letter furnishes a grand total for the earnings of Lamartine, and at the same time shows the feeling of legitimate pride which the writer took in his brave though unsuccessful struggle:—"J'afficherai quand on voudra, sur tous les murs de Paris, que j'ai effectivement payé plus de six millions en quatorze ans d'efforts surhumains, sans avoir reçu un sou du gouvernement, excepté l'autorisation accordée à tout le monde d'une loterie qui n'a pas coûté un sou ni aux contribuables ni à l'Etat."¹

The use of the words "quatorze ans d'efforts surhumains," in the above letter, are amply justified, for poet though he was, none of his misfortunes can be ascribed to a want of capacity for hard work. An examination of his early letters shows that he was a hard worker even before he was forced to be so by financial necessities. His early poems were the result of much thought, and his success later as an orator in the Chambre des Députés was largely due, according to his own confession, to incessant labor. "Je travaille, travaille, travaille comme au collège" he writes in 1838 while a member of this body,² and in a letter of the preceding year he had made the following hazardous admission: "Je fais en secret des vers par milliers depuis six semaines, entre quatre heures du matin et le jour. Si les électeurs le savaient!"³ He was a tremendous worker in his later years. A letter from the year 1852 furnishes evidence that, at the age of sixty-two, he finished a volume of four hundred pages in twenty-four days,⁴ while five years later, when sixty-seven years old, five hundred pages of his *Vie d'Alexandre le Grand* were completed in thirty days.⁵ His literary reputation suffered greatly from this method of work, but the energy and determination of the aged writer in his efforts to meet thus his financial obligations call for admiration.

¹ *Lamartine inconnu*, p. 272.

² *Correspondance*, III, 452.

³ *Ibid.*, III, 441.

⁴ *Lamartine inconnu*, p. 106.

⁵ Letter of Mlle Valentine de Cessia (October 31, 1857), *Lamartine inconnu*, p. 157.

Lamartine was not understood in his day, and during the last years of his life it was the fashion to deride his weaknesses and to belittle his greatness. He was caricatured in the papers and ridiculed in the music-halls; the impecuniosity of the poet was held up to scorn, all possible changes being rung on the bitter jest that in his case the *lyre* had become a *tirelire*, and similar unkind witticisms. In these present days, when the lapse of fifty years since the death of Lamartine makes a proper perspective of his works possible, his literary achievements take a high rank. In a like manner his life, viewed through his letters, contains many praiseworthy features. The few weaknesses which have been touched upon in this article are counterbalanced by admirable traits of character, not the least of which is that sense of personal honor which forced him to such arduous toil in order to meet his financial obligations.

D. H. CARNAHAN

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

BERTRAND DE BAR-SUR-AUBE AND AYMERI DE NARBONNE

In 1903 (*Romania*, XXXII, 353-56) Suchier showed that Scholastica, daughter of Henry II of Champagne, having married Guillaume V of Vienne, Count of Mâcon, it is more than probable that Bertrand de Bar-sur-Aube wrote the chanson *Girart de Vienne* for Guillaume and Scholastica, in view of the fact that the counts of Vienne boasted of having the epic hero for their ancestor. The marriage is supposed to have been concluded about 1190; Guillaume having died in 1224, it follows that *Girart de Vienne* was composed during the period 1190 to 1224.

As for the chanson *Aymeri de Narbonne*, Louis Demaison, in the introduction to his critical edition of the poem, shows that it was composed between 1205 and 1225 (pp. 81, 89-91). Demaison and Suchier are both of the opinion that *Girart de Vienne* is anterior to *Aymeri de Narbonne* (Demaison, pp. 73-77; Suchier, introduction to *Les Narbonnais*, 1898, p. 54). Demaison thinks that neither of the two poems can lay claim to originality, but that Bertrand has used two older poems, enriching their action by numerous episodes drawn from his own imagination; that, in other words, both the extant poems are only *rifacimenti* of lost originals (pp. 92-97). The messengers sent to Pavia, their adventures during their stay in the capital, their fight against the Germans, the taking of Narbonne by the Saracens and its final conquest by the French, all this seems to have been brought in by Bertrand.

It will be seen very soon that the Savari episode, in which a hateful rôle is given the Germans and which has repeatedly attracted the attention of the critics, allows a greater precision in dating the chansons.

Some details of the episode in question are necessary; I quote from the edition of *Aymeri de Narbonne* by Louis Demaison (Société des anciens textes français, Paris, 1887).

On their trip to Italy, to the court of the Lombard King Boniface, the ambassadors of Aymeri, among whom knights like Girart de Roussillon, Hugo and Gui are especially to be noted, soon after

passing the Alps meet with a squadron of three hundred German knights. Their leader, Savari, addresses the French band in the most insolent manner, asking them the purpose of their expedition (vss. 1609-46):

Vont s'en li mes sanz nule demorée . . .
 Chevauchant vont a grant esperonnée,
 Tant qu'il costoient .I. brueil, lez une prée . . .
 A tant encontrent a senestre, a l'entrée,
 I. Aleman de molt grant renommée,
 Viellarz estoit, s'ot la barbe mellée;
 C'ert Savaris qui grant gent a menée:
 III^e estoient, chascuns la teste armée,
 Des Alemanz des mieuz de sa contrée.
 Vestu estoient comme gent mal senée:
 Chascuns avoit une gorne lée
 Et une jupe de gros agnias forrée,
 Solers a ganches et chauces havetées,
 Aumuce el chief et par devant orlée.
 Si ot chascuns ceinte molt longue espée,
 Une toise ot, s'ele fust mesurée,
 Et targe avoit roonde au col posée.
 Et si chevauchent comme gent forsenée:
 Tel i ot ive a quee recopée
 Ou haut cheval a grant teste levée.
 Et quant il ont nostre gent avisée,
 En haut s'escrivent comme gent desfaée
 "Godehelspe!" a molt grant alenée.
 Mes Savaris qui ot la barbe lée,
 Parla romanz, que la terre ot usée;
 Contre noz contes s'en vet de randonnée;
 Quant pres d'eus fu, s'a sa voiz escriviée:
 "Ou iroiz vos, fole gent esgarée ?
 "Qui est vos sire et de quelle contrée ?
 "Normanz senblez, c'est verité provée,
 "Qui tel orgueil menez et tel ponée.
 "Ainz que voiez de Pavie l'entrée,
 "Sera molt chier cele robe achetée;
 "N'en enimeroiz vaillant une denréee!"

Girart de Roussillon informs Savari of the object of their expedition. Savari maintains, in the same arrogant tone, that he has been promised the hand of Hermengart and that he will never allow the

French to proceed on their journey. Count Gui, angry at this insolence, tells his countrymen to get ready for battle; the Germans prepare on their part and attack the French in a vigorous assault, shouting their battle cry "Godeherre." Savari does not show himself especially eager for the honor of fighting in the first rank. He keeps his own person in the background, leaving his people to fight for him. Only once he feels enough courage to attack Hugo from behind, wounding him slightly with his spear; but when Hugo turns his horse, he flees before his opponent can attack him. The battle goes on, Savari's nephew, Goniot, kills Aymeri de Losengne, but is mortally wounded by Girart de Roussillon, whereupon the latter kills another German, called Hugo. A second assault of the Germans, who are still by far superior in numbers, is equally unsuccessful. A German, called Gracien, wounds Girart de Roussillon from behind, throwing him from his horse. For this treachery he is justly punished by Gui, who kills him. Savari flees with the few knights who survive, hoping to have his revenge later and trusting in the assistance of his brother, Bishop Morant of Verciaus (Verceil, Piedmont) (vss. 1666-1940). I quote the passage showing Savari's cowardice (vss. 1932-40):

Qant Savaris voit cel encombrement,
A l'einz qu'il pot, s'en est tornez fuiant.
Dist a ses homes: "N'alez plus atendant!
"Ce sont deable, par le mien esciēnt!
"Se a Verciaus estions ça devant,
"Lors avrions et secors et garant:
"Mes freres est li evesques Morant;
"Vengerai nos de ceste male gent,
"Qui ça derrier nos chacent"

The poet asserts that Savari was the first to flee, far ahead of his men and so precipitately that there was no hope for the pursuing Frenchmen to reach him. He continues his flight to Verciaus, yet the townspeople refuse to open the gate to him; they even throw stones on the heads of his knights. Nay, he has to undergo a still greater humiliation: a Lombard (that is, a coward, the Lombards being generally considered as cowards during the middle ages) wounds him and throws him from his horse (vss. 1941-75). The French ambassadors continue their journey to Pavia.

Savari, however, does not forget his shameful defeat. He is waiting in ambush for the French to pass by on their trip home. Hugo, foreseeing the danger, persuades his comrades to descend from their mules and to mount their steeds. Savari incites his vassals to take revenge for the defeat inflicted upon them, while Hugo cheers on his little squadron against the coward Savari (vss. 1952-2792). The latter summons the French to surrender (vss. 2798-2803):

Randez vos tost, fiz a putain, gloton!
Ne vos vadroit la desfanse .I. bouton.
En Alemengne vos menrai en prison;
A mon talant en prendrai venjoison,
Et si me plest, s'en avrai raençon!

The battle begins. A hundred new men come to help Savari, shouting "Godehelpe" in a loud voice, and kill Hugo's horse. The little band of French knights is suffering greatly from the superiority in numbers of the enemy. They take refuge in a nearby tower. While Hugo sets out for Narbonne to inform Aymeri of what has happened, the knights in the tower are well received by the owner, a "vavassal." The Germans lay siege to the tower. Hugo brings the news to Aymeri who heads a rescue. Noticing the approach of Aymeri's army, Savari's cowardice reveals itself again in a decision to flee. But Hugo, foreseeing this, prevents the flight of the enemy. Savari is terror-stricken; he drops from his horse, imploring his enemy to spare his life, and is taken prisoner. The rest of the Germans flee in all directions; some of them are killed, some escape. Hugo delivers Savari up to the owner of the tower, that he might get a large ransom and thus be rewarded for his good services. (vss. 2802-3236.)

As can be seen from the résumé given and the passages quoted, Savari and his German knights are depicted in the worst light: their arrogance toward people whom they suppose to be weaker than themselves, their cowardice and their having resort to treachery was surely meant by the poet to have some effect on his hearers or readers. This rôle given to the Germans is the more striking since it is unique in the littérature of the Chansons de Geste. For Gui d'Allemagne, in the *Couronnement de Louis*, is little more than a figure-head; the same can be said of the emperor in *Bave de Hamstone*. The rôle of

the Saxons cannot be considered, because the religious motif comes into play, the Saxons being pagans like the Saracens. Why then did Bertrand de Bar ascribe this rôle to the Germans? It is likely that a satisfactory solution of the problem can be found in the political circumstances of the poet's time.

Thibaut III, Count of Champagne, died May 24, 1201, in the midst of active preparations for his participation in the Fourth Crusade, leaving his wife, Blanche of Navarre, regent for his posthumous son, Thibaut IV, later the famous Thibaut le Chansonnier. From the first day of her widowhood Blanche had to defend herself against the attacks and intrigues of numerous enemies, who tried to deprive her and her child of their fief. The most dangerous of them all was no doubt Erard de Brienne, husband of Philippina, daughter of Henry II, Count of Champagne. Philippina was a pretender to the dignity of countess of that fief, while Henry II was a most powerful enemy because of his connections with several grandes of Burgundy and, above all, with Thibaut I, Duke of Lorraine, and his German vassals. Blanche succeeded in holding her own, thanks to her wise policy of securing the aid of Philip Augustus, King of France, which she obtained, not without making numerous concessions and sacrifices. In doing so, she had acted very wisely, foreseeing perhaps the great development which royalty was to take in the course of the 13th century. So she took without hesitation the part of the French King in his struggle with the German Emperor Otto IV. The decisive part taken by the nobility of Champagne on the battlefield of Bouvines is well known. They formed the right wing of the French position, and the destruction of the host of the Count of Flanders was due to their vigorous assault under the leadership of men like Hugues de Mareuil, who took prisoner Ferrand of Flanders, the Count of Saint-Pol, and Count Henry of Bar-le-Duc. With so much at stake in this struggle and with the actual spectacle of a German invading army before the people, it would be but natural that feeling in Champagne should run very high and that sentiments of hatred and antipathy against the Germans should be uttered. However we are not left to rely on this supposition alone. D'Arbois de Jubainville, in his *Histoire des Ducs et Comtes de Champagne*, II, pp. 17-18, mentions two registers of the chancery of Champagne,

testifying the joy of Blanche when she heard of the defeat suffered by Otto IV: she gave a fief as a reward to the messenger who brought the good news. D'Arbois de Jubainville gives the text of one of them:

Manesiers de Cosances, escuier mi sires li rois, hom liges a Madame la contesse de sa meson fort o tot le porpris et de L arpanz de terre que Madame la contesse li donna a essarter, quant il aporta les lettres de la victoire mi sires li rois, que les contes de Flandres, de Bouloigne et de Salebere estoient pris.

The most bitter enemy of Blanche, Thibaut I of Lorraine, had fought at Bouvines among the troops of Otto IV. Having escaped from the disaster, he continued to help Erard de Brienne in a sort of guerilla warfare which the latter adopted against Blanche, a war which was brought to an end by the interference of Pope Honorius III, who excommunicated Erard and his adherents, and of Frederick II, who took prisoner the Duke of Lorraine in 1218. It is very likely that those events did nothing to increase the little esteem in which the Germans were held by the inhabitants of Champagne since the day of Bouvines.

One last point. We have a document dated August 14, 1217, in which Blanche invites Manassès de Rosson and all the inhabitants of Aubepierre to take the oath of fidelity before the bishop of Langres. The place of the meeting was to be Bar-sur-Aube. The last visit paid by Blanche to Bar had been made in 1205, and we possess no document showing that she had taken up her residence in the castle of Bar during the interval, although we cannot complain of a lack of documents for that particular period. If she had not set foot in the old castle since 1205, there is nothing more natural than that her arrival and the whole meeting should have assumed the character of a festival. It is quite probable that on this occasion Bertrand composed the song on the defeats of Savari and his followers, the days of Bouvines and the German invasion of the country serving as a background in the minds of his hearers, many of whom no doubt had seen with their own eyes the clumsy apparel and heard the cry of "Godechellespe" of the hosts of Otto IV.

To summarize what has been said: the chanson *Aymery de Narbonne*, in its extant form, seems to have been composed under the influence of the battle of Bouvines, won by Philip Augustus and the

knights of Champagne on the 27th of July, 1214. When considering the poem in its structure, its spirit, and the large majority of its episodes, we find that it differs but little from the rest of the Chansons de Geste. Its make-up is that of the average Old French epic poem, with a goodly number of battle scenes, duels, sieges, and insolent messages. Its spirit breathes the religious fervor of the crusades, which in a general way considers the European world as one great nation, the people of God, who are fighting against His enemies, the Saracens. The great majority of the episodes are more or less commonplaces with well-known motifs, such as that of the cowardly Lombards, the princess giving way to her passion, etc. But the Savari episode, which occupies altogether a space of 918 verses, that is, about one-fifth of the whole poem, indicates a new spirit. It is for the first time that representatives of two Christian nations are seen to fight a regular Chanson de Geste battle. No longer do the German knights gather around the banner of Charlemagne, as auxiliaries of the French, to attack the common enemy of Christendom; no longer do they form an integral part of the great Christian and French army, the embodiment of the mediaeval ideal of a world-theocracy. The Savari episode reveals the existence of two different nations with an independent national spirit, with their characteristics as they appeared to the biassed mind of the French minstrel, but none the less pronounced and based upon actual facts. The French national spirit has been aroused, certainly under the influence of the victory of Bouvines. And it is significant that at the same period Walther von der Vogelweide on the other side of the Rhine expressed the same feelings of national pride. But still a certain local patriotism seems to be a great deal stronger than nationalism, and while in France at large the victory does not seem to have deeply stirred the people, in a corner of Champagne a minstrel puts into the frame of a Chanson de Geste all his antipathy against the invaders. It was in all probability the hatred of the population of Champagne for Thibaut I of Lorraine and his German vassals, the enemies of the regent Blanche of Navarre, which inspired the poet. Consequently, *Aymeri de Narbonne* was possibly composed after the battle of Bouvines, probably between July 1214 and 1218, year of the final defeat of Thibaut I of Lorraine, and more precisely, about 1217,

date of the arrival of Blanche at Bar-sur-Aube, at the time of the impending defeat of her enemies.

Girart de Vienne being anterior to *Aymeri de Narbonne*, it would follow that the former of the two poems was composed between 1190 and 1214 (1217).

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE

CHICAGO

THE TECHNIQUE OF SCRIBE'S COMÉDIES-VAUDEVILLES

The two men who, before 1850, did the most to improve and perfect the technique and mechanical construction of the French drama were Beaumarchais and Scribe. Before the time of *Le Barbier de Séville*, plot and action had made very little progress, at least in the comedy; and if all the tragedies of Racine and some of those of Corneille are models of theatrical carpentry, this fact results more from the strength of passion and the truth of the characterizations than from any ingenious combinations in the plot. Molière, Regnard, and Marivaux offer very little improvement. The most carefully constructed of Molière's plays, *Les Femmes savantes*, ends in the most elementary way, by means of a fictitious letter. In Marivaux there is scarcely any plot. The *Barbier de Séville* and the *Mariage de Figaro* bring the comedy of intrigue for the first time to a high point of development, both of them skilful pieces of theatrical sleight-of-hand, attacked and developed with a sureness of touch for which one will find no precedent in French dramatic literature, going back even to *Le Menteur*. These two plays lead directly, with such intermediaries as *Les Etourdis* of Andrieux, *La Jeunesse de Henri V* of Duval, and *Les Marionnettes* of Picard, to whom belongs the most important place in the history of the comedy between Beaumarchais and Scribe, to the school of the *pièce bien faite*, with Scribe at its head.

It is a commonplace that Scribe was the greatest technician in the history of the French drama and that all the dramatists of the nineteenth century who aimed at constructive excellence profit, consciously or unconsciously, from the new models which he gave to dramatic art, and show his influence as an inventor and manager of plots. It is perhaps not so clearly realized that he first displayed and exercised his technical skill in an inferior *genre*, the *comédie-vaudeville*, for which he practically invented a new form, raising it to a height never before reached, and making of it a vehicle for light sketching of manners. Scribe's best five-act comedies are, as far as

technique is concerned, merely highly developed *comédies-vauDEVilles*. The comedy of manners of Augier, the *pièce à thèse* of Dumas fils, and all the plays of Sardou, derive their form and construction from the comedies and *comédies-vauDEVilles* of Scribe.

The *comédie-vauDEVille* of the eighteenth century was characterized by technical inferiority, literary worthlessness, and vulgarity. Since the days of Lesage, Favart, and Panard, it had followed two courses, tending to be either the rehandling of some anecdote or incident, or a satirical criticism of the vices and follies of the day. In either case its greatest charm lay in its gaiety, its rapidity of action, and in the more or less farcical handling of the situations. It remained faithful to its origins, always smacking of the fair, and possessed to a high degree the two essential elements of the farce: actuality and general satire. During and after the Revolution of 1789 the *comédie-vauDEVille* flourished as never before, and, in the hands of Bouilly, Radet, Piis, Desfontaines, and Barré, began to show evidences of greater literary worth, although it remained for Scribe to make of it a real literary *genre*.

Scribe desired, above all, to attract and amuse large audiences, and he realized that he could best do this by giving them light pieces with brilliantly developed plots, full of complications and *quidproquos*, enlivened by witty dialogue and graceful verses. A public worn out emotionally by the horrors of the Revolution and by the disasters of the Empire could best be entertained if its curiosity were aroused by a skilfully prepared plot, if its interest were held by a brilliant development of this plot, and if its expectations were satisfied by a logical, constantly foreseen dénouement. Clearness and logic being two qualities which Scribe possessed to the highest degree, he employed them with the realization that to hold his public he must be clear, and that if he were to be clear, he must so order his action and plot that the spectator could follow easily and with pleasure the different courses of the action.

Among the gifts with which Scribe was more highly endowed than any other dramatist of the nineteenth century was that theatrical instinct which enabled him to see at a glance the essentially dramatic elements of a situation. He lived, moved, and had his being in things theatrical; the incidents of everyday life were to him so many

dramatic possibilities and he saw in everything a source of stage material. The most ordinary situation, the most unpromising anecdote, the scene least likely to suggest theatrical possibilities to one less gifted with this sense of the theater, gave him ideas which he would translate into dramatic action. Perhaps no one has ever had more than he the ability to see instantly which side of a situation would be most interesting when set before the public; no dramatic author has excelled him in the power to discover at each moment theatrical combinations of new and striking effect. He was able not only to discover these dramatic situations, but to translate them instantly into stage pictures; he did not have to develop and perfect them slowly. This fertility of dramatic invention explains in part his extraordinary popularity during the twenty-five years in which he reigned supreme in the four or five best theaters of Paris.

For many years, ever since Théophile Gautier began his merciless attacks upon his popular contemporary, and ever since Théodore de Banville called him "Mossou Scribe," it has been customary to dismiss Scribe with a word, as being simply a dramatic carpenter, as one devoid of those higher qualities of the dramatic author, and as a mere mechanician. Yet the fact remains that it is not every writer for the stage that has that genius for making people see things in a certain way, not necessarily the true way, but which seems momentarily the only way, to those whom the author wishes to persuade that they have seen what he sees. To be able to do this, one must be gifted with an inborn sense of perspective, of dramatic values, which enables one to sketch a character or a passion in a word. Scribe's originality and fertility of invention are conspicuous in his handling of stage conventions. To a certain extent the plot of a *comédie-vudeville* is necessarily conventional. The obdurate father, the sentimental heroine, the interested and the disinterested lover, the scheming valet or soubrette, love quarrels, jealousies, mistakes, and disguises—all those things by which the machinery of a plot is kept in motion, remain in substance the same. Scribe shows the greatest ingenuity in varying these combinations, when possible; when not, he presents them under an aspect which gives a new direction to our sympathies, boldly siding with the parent against

the lover, with prudence and calculation against rashness and extravagance. Indeed, he is most successful when he goes against the established current of theatrical sympathies; his championship of reason against romance, his defense of common sense as opposed to sentiment and passion, are resources by recurring to which he endeavors to impart new aspects to hackneyed and conventional stage themes.

No less noticeable is his dexterity in handling a complicated plot. There are many of his plays whose plots involve some absurdity or improbability, in which certain scenes hover on the brink of melodramatic exaggeration, yet by his discretion, and by his constant command of effective dialogue, he winds himself out of all his entanglements just as the spectator is beginning to think his case hopeless. No matter what the inherent weakness of a plot, he always manages to impart to it at least a temporary and artificial *vraisemblance*.

Scribe's dramatic theory, if indeed he had so clearly formulated his ideas and methods as to make of them a theory, was that one event may, by its influence, produce others, acting upon each other and mingling their effects until the impetus of the original event has been spent. For him the dramatic interest and value of a situation lay, not in the clash of characters and will that it may produce, nor in the study of the passions causing it or arising from it, but in the combination of circumstances and complexity of interests it may bring about. He selects some incident of ordinary life which to him seems curious or interesting. This fact is put in action; in its course it comes into collision with various obstacles placed artfully in its way, from which it rebounds until, after a certain number of recoils and springs, it stops, its force of action having been spent. This conception of dramatic art by its nature relieves the author of the responsibility of taking account of characters, sentiment, or passion.

Fertility of invention, dexterity in selecting the proper elements of a situation, and ingenuity in arranging these elements did not go alone in Scribe; to them he added that without which these gifts would have been of little avail: careful and effective planning of the various scenes of the play. He was not satisfied to present his scenes in a haphazard fashion; he trusted neither to luck nor to

wit to redeem a badly constructed plot. So important to him was the plan that he often said: "When I have finished my plan, I have nothing more to do." He insisted that every entrance and exit should be in its proper place and that the scenes should follow each other in the clearest and most logical order. Scribe's chief desire being to entertain, he realized that to do this he must first of all be clear, so that nothing might be unexplained or misunderstood.

To accomplish this, his first concern was to see that in the opening scenes the subject should be well exposed and the audience sure as to what the action was to concern. The expositions in his plays are nearly always clear and firmly handled. The different threads of the action are skilfully stretched and the entire exposition is so enlivened with bright dialogue and pretty couplets that the machinery is cleverly disguised and the audience listens patiently.

But to be clear would not have been enough had the action moved fitfully, rapid here and lagging there; to hold the interest of the spectator, whose interest has been aroused by a dexterous exposition, it is essential that everything tend, directly or indirectly, to hasten the solution of the difficulties encountered in the course of the action. If certain characters are superfluous, if one or two scenes are digressive and retard the march of events, interfering with the play of the various forces upon each other, the spectator grows restless and the spell is broken. This constant, logical progression of events is a characteristic of nearly all of Scribe's vaudevilles.

Knowing that nothing is so apt to annoy an audience as to have some incident occur without warning, Scribe was always careful to scatter here and there in the early parts of the play words which at the time seemed of no consequence but which prepared the mind of the listener for the great event in the later scenes. Nothing is left to be taken on faith by the audience; all that happens is the logical result of what has happened earlier, or what has been hinted at. No less responsible for his hold upon the public was his practice of taking the spectator into his confidence, of letting him know the things which were withheld from some of the characters in the play. In this way he succeeded in establishing some kind of a tacit understanding between himself and his audience that certain situations, which, if examined too closely, were improbable or farcical, were temporarily

to be accepted. More than this, he realized that it is human nature to enjoy being in a secret, and that the pleasure derived from watching the efforts of a character to overcome a certain difficulty, but constantly baffled by ignorance of some condition which the onlooker knows well, is greater than that of being kept in the dark and being made to wonder just what is wrong. The comic element in his plays is nearly always the result of the situations themselves, in which some of the characters are talking or acting with one object in view, while the others have something else in mind. In such scenes the actions are always at cross-purposes and the spectator is the only one who knows the secret of the situation.

Having thus clearly exposed the subject, arranged each incident and scene in its proper place, so ordered the action that it is rapid and constant, and always sufficiently explained, he brings it to a logical, even inevitable, conclusion. He probably did not, however, work in the order just described; the *dénouement* being the most vital part of a play, he always had it clearly in mind before the plot was fully developed. He was aware that a hastily accomplished *dénouement*, convenient, but not logical, would spoil the best play and disgruntle the most indulgent audience. That the *dénouement* should be the only real consequence of the combinations of characters and events was a fundamental law with him, and in his most complicated pieces he never loses sight of what is to be the outcome of all the *péripéties* and *coups de théâtre* with which he complicates the action. Everything tends toward one end, which every element of the play announces and prepares for, and each scene makes the spectator more anxious to know the outcome.

Thus, starting with the conventional *vaudeville farce*, *vaudeville anecdotique* and *vaudeville satirique*, Scribe, by early applying the formula of the intensive plot, of the plot built upon a dovetailing of *quidproquos*, had before long developed the *genre* into a *vaudeville intrigué*. Having thus made of the vaudeville a more pretentious form by grafting it on to the *comédie d'intrigue*, he gradually enlarged the new vaudeville, by weaving into it a sketch of manners, until he reached the comedy of manners. In the transformation of the vaudeville into the *comédie-vaudeville de mœurs*, three stages may be noticed: first, there is a modification in the structure of the play,

a more careful combination of the various elements, greater dexterity in building the framework and more logical arrangement in the succession of scenes, in the action and in the dénouement. Second, the rôle of the couplet is gradually reduced until finally it disappears completely. Third, the later plays, while keeping their humorous and sparkling quality, become somewhat more sentimental in tone, more reserved and more restrained than the lighter *vaudeville-farce*.

NEIL C. ARVIN

RICE INSTITUTE
HOUSTON, TEX.



REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Casos Cervantinos que Tocan a Valladolid. By NARCISO ALONSO CORTÉS. Madrid: Junta para Ampliación de Estudios e Investigaciones Científicas, 1916.

The third centennial of Cervantes' death has produced something better than the florid oratory common on such occasions. Many new facts have been discovered throwing light upon the author of *Don Quijote*, his family and friends. Recent as is the publication of Fitzmaurice-Kelly's admirable biography (*Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. A Memoir*), one can no longer trust that work alone for a complete knowledge of the facts of Cervantes' life. A new edition is already desirable. Rodríguez Marín, Amezúa, González Auñoles, Ortega, and Alonso Cortés have all contributed new information. If most of it is of slight importance, the sum total is very respectable.

In the present book Alonso Cortés deals mainly with the Cervantes family as related to Valladolid. Rodríguez Marín had shown that Córdoba was the real home of the family and that the connection with Alcalá de Henares, the novelist's birthplace, was only temporary. The present author tries to trace back the family history farther, to Talavera. He shows that numerous members of the clan Cervantes inhabited that town, but he is unsuccessful in connecting the southern branch of the family with that of the north. True, Cervantes terms Talavera *la mejor tierra de Castilla*, but this encomium hardly proves that he regarded the town as the family *solar*. Alonso Cortés is on firmer ground when he begins to consider the history of the Licenciate Juan de Cervantes, Miguel's grandfather. Rodríguez Marín has shown that the latter settled in Alcalá de Henares in 1505, where his son Rodrigo was born, and that he resided there six years. In 1516 we find him back in Córdoba and in 1523 holding the post of *teniente de corregidor* in Cuenca. Every lover of Cervantes would like to believe with Rodríguez Marín that in sketching the portrait of the poor and upright *teniente de corregidor* in *La Galanilla* the author took his own grandfather as a model. Unfortunately it is difficult to reconcile the ideal portrait with the facts concerning the Licenciado Juan now brought to light. In 1528 he held the post of *oidor del Consejo del duque del Infantado* in Guadalajara. Alonso Cortés has unearthed the documents of a most unsavory suit between Juan's daughter Marfa and the Archdeacon Martín de Mendoza. It would appear that the father not only winked at the illicit relations of his daughter with

this dissolute prelate of influential family, but also abetted her in a blackmailing suit which she brought against him. It has long been known that two of Miguel's sisters and his daughter Isabel were adventuresses constantly seeking to involve unwary lovers in the toils of the law. We now know that this unpleasant family tradition which persisted for three generations started with the novelist's aunt, María. Such unpleasant discoveries illustrate the dangers of genealogical research. Poverty could not be pleaded in extenuation. Witnesses depose that Juan de Cervantes maintained *gran fausto de casa*. They associated with nobles, participated in tilts and tourneys, had slaves, servants, pages, and outriders, wore silks and other costly fineries. How different from the household which could not produce a piece of silver with which to cross the gypsy's palm!

Such prosperity did not long accompany Rodrigo de Cervantes, the surgeon, and his family. Rodrigo seems to have left Alcalá for Valladolid about 1551, when Miguel was only four years old. The father soon became a victim of extortion on the part of a certain Gregorio Romano. He was imprisoned for debt, and to secure release instituted a *pleito de hidalgua*. He had no difficulty in establishing his noble rank, but to regain solvency was a different matter. Plainly Rodrigo de Cervantes was a ne'er-do-well. The documents in the Romano trial enable us to follow the dismal fortunes of the family in Valladolid through 1553. Alonso Cortés plausibly conjectures that they continued to reside in that city until 1561, when they appear in Madrid. Much interesting material is given concerning the Trinitarian father, Juan Gil, whose biography Señor Ortega is now writing, about the Valladolid poets mentioned in the *Canto de Calíope*, and concerning the family of the novelist's wife, Catalina de Salazar. The final chapter, devoted to Cervantes' last stay in Valladolid, contains little new material. Suffice it to say that no documentary evidence has been found proving his presence there previous to 1605.

Señor Alonso Cortés is to be congratulated on the acquisition of important new material and his honesty in not attempting to gloss over unpleasantries. Many interesting details are here passed over in silence. In interpreting his documents he occasionally indulges in too much speculation.

GEORGE T. NORTHUP

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

